

THE
Catholic Mind

order No 1073

VOL. I

JANUARY, 1952

NO. 1069

Ambassador to the Holy See

JOHN B. COLLINS

Editor, The PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC

*Reprinted from the PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC**

MANY Protestant churchmen have condemned the decision of President Truman, announced Saturday, October 20, to inaugurate full diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican and to send General Mark Clark to Vatican City as Ambassador. Some of them have been restrained and calm in voicing their objections; others have been bitter and severe. Most of them say the appointment is a violation of the "principle" or "tradition" of separation of Church and State; a few go so far as to call it unconstitutional.

If those are the real grounds for their protests, there should be little difficulty in determining whether they are justified or not. The "un-constitutional" claim is obviously silly, for the Constitution expressly provides (Art. II, Sec. 2) that the President "shall nominate and by and with the consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors." (Mr. Truman did submit the nomination of General Clark to the Senate, although too late to be acted on before adjournment; if he makes an interim arrangement it can only stand until the Senate meets again.)

As to the "separation of Church and State" tradition or principle, it is necessary to know what it is, before it can be shown that this appointment violated it. The expression itself does not appear in the

* 404 Magee Bldg., Pittsburgh 22, Pa., Oct. 25, 1951.

Constitution, nor in any law enacted by Congress; and those who put the "principle" forward as their justification for opposing the sending of an Ambassador have no right to expect that some capricious or arbitrary meaning they assign to the term will be accepted by everyone else.

The Constitution does say (First Amendment) that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This plainly means that the State shall not interfere with the lawful activities of religious organizations, and that no religious organization shall attempt to control the State. That is what "separation of Church and State" amounts to.

THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Now the civil government, under the natural law as well as the Constitution, has the positive obligation to promote and protect the welfare of its citizens. It is in fulfillment of that obligation that the government has its diplomatic corps, so that it may keep in touch with developments throughout the world and shape its policies for the good of its people. And the President has not only the right, but a solemn duty to send an ambassador or other representative wherever he thinks it is necessary or advisable in the national interest.

If he thinks this country will profit from contacts that can be made at the Vatican, not only with Vatican officials but with representatives of other nations assigned there, then it is his right and duty to send a representative there. The decision is expressly placed in his hands, subject only to "the consent of the Senate."

As a matter of fact, then, the Protestant ministers who are urging and leading official action by their churches in opposition to this constitutional action by the President are themselves coming perilously close to violating the real principle of separation of Church and State. As individuals, of course, they are free to criticize any and all public officials, but when they attempt to have their churches, as such, bring pressure on the President to dissuade him from doing what the Constitution allows and requires him to do, they are on mighty unsafe ground.

But do these objections voiced by Protestant clergymen really represent Protestant opinion in this country? There will probably be a Gallup poll on the subject before long, but in the meantime it should be remembered that the principals in the appointment, President Tru-

72566

man and General Clark, are both Protestants. And as for general public opinion, it is interesting to see what some of the leading newspapers of the country said, editorially, on the subject. Here is a pretty good cross-section—east, south and west:

EDITORIAL COMMENT

New York Times: "Putting the whole problem in common-sense terms, this is an experiment that is worth trying."

New York Herald-Tribune: "A strong case can be made out for establishing regular diplomatic relations between the United States and Vatican City. The . . . manner of doing it was extremely inept."

New York Daily News: "We hope the Senate will confirm Clark, on the basis that the appointment, being good for our country, should not be stopped by religious differences. . . . But we also hope the voters next year, Catholic and Protestant, will keep in mind that Truman took this worthy step in a totally unworthy way. . . ."

New York World-Telegram: "Whether the new policy proves justified or not, we think the President has gone about it in a wrong way. . . . American representation at the Vatican is not, in our view, an undermining factor as such" (of the separation of Church and State tradition).

Chicago Tribune: "It is difficult to believe that anything the country may gain from the embassy can compensate for the cleavage at home that has already developed. . . ."

Boston Herald: "The hurt he (President Truman) has done to national unity detracts from the good he has done for the world's defense against Communism. . . . Continued Protestant objection will do no good service. . . ."

Boston Christian Science Monitor: "This is not a religious issue. . . . It is an issue of statecraft. . . . We believe (all) should see the injurious potentialities in such a precedent."

Cleveland Plain Dealer: "Criticism seems to be founded on a false premise. General Clark will no more be a representative to the Catholic Church as a religious body than the Ambassador to Britain is a representative to the Church of England. . . ."

Washington Post: "... a bold and highly provocative stroke of statesmanship. . . . In picking General Mark Clark . . . the President has shown good judgment."

Washington Star: "The appointment . . . is no more likely to affect adversely the separation of Church and State, as recognized and practiced in our country, than our diplomatic recognition of Israel. . . . But . . . the President has now invited a debate which will divide religious groups. . . . Mr. Truman has made a mistake."

San Francisco Chronicle: "The over-all common sense of the President's position seems to us to be unassailable."

Portland Oregonian: "There seems reason enough to have official ties with the Vatican, constricted though it is as a temporal state. We are concerned, however, that the President should find it necessary to name a military figure . . ."

Chattanooga News-Free Press: "President Truman has committed an unpardonable offense against the 50,000,000 Protestants of America and has done the nation as a whole a grave injury."

Memphis Commercial Appeal: "President Truman's appointment of General Clark to be the first Ambassador to the Vatican is thoroughly wise and in order."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "... the nation is now to witness an internal struggle between those who approve the President's course and the many others who are equally certain that he has done a grievous disservice to the historic separation of Church and State in our democracy."

Dallas News: "The News has opposed diplomatic representation at the Vatican on the Church-State issue . . . but the psychological effect on the huge bloc of Roman Catholics on both sides of the Iron Curtain may be beneficial."

Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer: "Mr. Truman has not sent a personal representative to a listening post but named an Ambassador to a church which undertakes to be a state as well."

Hartford Courant: "Whatever one may think about the President's nomination . . . nothing can be said in defense of Mr. Truman's method of procedure."

Detroit Free Press: "Fears expressed by some Protestant leaders are unjustified . . . We need all the support we can get from every source, regardless of likes and dislikes, passions or prejudices, to save American democracy against a ruthless, brutal and Godless enemy."

It will be seen that these editorial comments do not add up, by any means, to a warm, enthusiastic approval of the step Mr. Truman has taken; there are political reservations, and there is concern about causing division on religious lines, and there is considerable uncertainty. But there is only minimum support for the claim that the Church-State principle has been violated; that idea, which seems to be an obsession with the Protestant ministers who have been quoted, just doesn't register, it is safe to say, in the average man's mind.

This being the case, it may be doubted that there is any real danger that the appointment will split the country along religious lines. Catholics are not at all excited about the matter: they weren't campaigning to have an Ambassador appointed, and they have regarded the matter as something to be settled on the basis of what is best for the United States. They agree that the decision is a good one, but they don't want to quarrel with their Protestant neighbors over it, and they feel that before long common sense will cool off the excitement of the moment.

In the final analysis, of course, it was nothing but religious prejudice that kept the United States from sending an Ambassador to the Vatican long ago, as most of the nations were doing. Prejudice established the "tradition" that we shouldn't be represented there, and then to justify the prejudice, the "tradition" was appealed to. Once such "traditions" are fixed it is hard to dislodge them, but it can be done. From 1905 to 1933 there was a "tradition" that a Catholic shouldn't be named to a President's Cabinet; then President Roosevelt broke that "tradition," and now it is completely forgotten.

President Truman is being accused, by his political foes, of all sorts of craftiness and trickery for disregarding the taboo which prejudice had set up between this country and the Vatican, but he deserves the highest credit for the moral courage he displayed. The result is bound to be beneficial to the country.



Inevitability of Communism

When Communists talk of the inevitability of Communism, there is more in what they say than first meets the eye. Given a godless world, Communism is inevitable. God is love. Turn from God and you turn inevitably towards hatred. In a world possessed by hatred, Communism is inevitable for the simple reason that Communism is merely the organized political expression of mass hatred.—*Hamish Fraser in the CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT, October, 1951.*

Via Crucis: A Franciscan Devotion

EARL GOEDEN O.F.M. CAP.

*Reprinted from the ROUND TABLE OF FRANCISCAN RESEARCH**

THE Way of the Cross has long been considered a Franciscan devotion. Certainly the extraordinary holiness of St. Francis stemmed from his fervent devotion to Christ Crucified. And is it not true that every Franciscan from the time of the Seraph of Assisi has had an especial love for the Passion of Jesus Christ? It was only fitting, then, that the Franciscans should take up this devotion in the seventeenth century and gradually spread it throughout the entire Christian world.

Historians dispute about the origin of the *Via Crucis*. Some scholars, following a pious tradition, maintain that this devotion sprang from the Blessed Virgin's custom of retracing her Son's bloody footsteps after His death on Calvary's hill. Others hold that such an opinion lacks historical foundation, and claim that the devotion of the Stations arose from the desire of European peoples to reproduce in their towns and villages the *Loca Sacra* of the Holy Land. Yet another view holds that this devotion was the gradual result of the piety of the people in the Middle Ages to relive, as best they could, the tragedy

of the last hours of their beloved Saviour.

At any rate, the devotion originally started in the Flemish part of Belgium and later, during the first half of the seventeenth century, spread into Spain and Italy through the efforts of the Franciscans. The most ancient forms of this devotion, however, are found in Germany, especially in Northern Germany. There, the Stations consisted of any number of sculptured images or painted pictures. The most ancient form of the Stations is the one at Luleå which dates back to 1468. Most famous of these German stations, however, are the *Septem Christi Casus* at Nuremberg (1505) and the group at Bamberg (1500), which were created by a famous artisan of that time, Adam Krafft, and still can be seen.

In 1511, many groups of indulgenced stations were erected in Tyrol, some even at the insistence of the Emperor Maximilian. Pope Leo X in 1520 granted an indulgence of one hundred days to a set of sculptured stations representing the Seven Dolors of Our Lady, erected in the cemetery of the Franciscan friary at

* Marathon, Wisc., October, 1951.

Antwerp. This was a very popular devotion of the times. The so-called Reformation took its toll also of this pious Catholic practice, but toward the end of the sixteenth century the devotion flourished again in various forms throughout all parts of Germany.

Perhaps the two most important names in connection with the devotion of the Way of the Cross, as we know it today, are those of Jan Pascha (John van Paeschen), Prior of the Carmelites at Mechlin, and Christian Andrichomius (Kruick van Andrichem), who died in 1585. In his work, *Peregrinatio Spiritualis*, published at Louvain in 1563, which contains an account of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Pascha enumerates fifteen stations as constituting the *Via Crucis*. Andrichomius, a fellow Belgian Carmelite, who was acquainted with Pascha's work, lists twelve stations in his account. These names are important because the twelve stations listed by Andrichomius, who depends to a certain extent on Pascha, coincide with our present first twelve stations.

Mention might also be made of several early manuscripts which treated of the devotion of the Way of the Cross. Especially noteworthy is the book published at Antwerp in 1536 and again in 1561 (which Pascha certainly used) entitled, *Domino Behelehem*. A manuscript dating from the first quarter of the sixteenth century

has been found in the convent of the Friars Minor at St. Trond and apparently was used by the community of religious of St. Lucy (who were possibly Franciscan tertiaries) who had a convent at St. Trond. Another important manuscript which contains a series of meditations on the Stations was printed at Bois de-Luc in 1540.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DEVOTION

The nature of the development of the *Via Crucis* and its manner of propagation are problems which scholars have not yet fully solved. One school of thought holds the view that the Stations as we know them today assumed their definitive form somewhere around the years 1600-1610; while others say that the first fourteen-station *Via Crucis* was erected by a Franciscan, Fr. Salvator Vitalis, in Florence on September 14, 1628. All agree, however, that the Franciscans played the principal role in spreading this devotion from Spain to the rest of Europe in the seventeenth century.

For three centuries now, the Franciscan Order has been the chief propagator of the *Via Crucis* devotion. In 1222, the first friars had gone to the Holy Land to visit those sites hallowed by their Divine Master. Just a little more than a century later (1342), the Holy See appointed the friars as custodians of those Holy Places. During those early years, the friars would organize the pilgrims touring Pales-

tine into small groups and would guide them around the Holy Places. At certain locations, the more prominent ones, e.g. the Praetorium, Olivet, Calvary, etc., the travelers would halt and recite some prayers. From this practice of stopping at the more prominent sites, the word "station" — stopping-place — took its origin. The spread of this devotion (though in multiple forms) on the European mainland during the following centuries seems to have been rapid. For it was only natural that other friars should endeavor to move the hearts of the faithful at home by the contemplation of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ just as their confreres, now the Holy Land custodians, were doing with the Christian pilgrims.

ST. LEONARD OF PORT MAURICE

Undoubtedly, the Franciscan who more than any other popularized this devotion was St. Leonard of Port Maurice (1676-1751). Whether in a village, a town or a famous city, this eloquent preacher of penance inevitably erected the fourteen stations of the *Via Crucis*, either with painted figures or in bas-relief. In Rome, he arranged for the erection of fourteen little chapels in the Coliseum for this devout exercise and December 27, 1750 marked the opening of this unique series of Stations. He himself composed and had printed a booklet of prayers for making the Way of the Cross, which led many of the

faithful to believe that the saint had founded this beautiful and meritorious devotion.

The *Via Crucis* devotion has always been the spiritual heritage of the Franciscan Order. Formerly, the indulgences for this devotion were gained only by those faithful who visited the Stations of the Holy Land, but later the faithful all over the world could gain the same indulgences by visiting any group of stations legitimately erected by authorization of the Minister General of the Observant Friars. We do not know the specific number of the indulgences granted to the Holy Land pilgrims, for the original acts which granted them were destroyed by a fire which consumed all the archives of the Holy Sepulcher in the convent of the Friars Minor at Jerusalem during the pontificate of Pope St. Pius V. Another restraining clause, later abrogated, stipulated that only those persons affiliated with the Franciscan Order and who performed this devotion in the churches of the Order could gain the indulgences.

At the request of the friars, Pope Innocent XI in 1686 confirmed the communication of indulgences to all those persons and places subject to the jurisdiction of the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor. These indulgences had been granted earlier during the reigns of Clement VIII in 1597, Paul V in 1609 and Urban VIII in 1625. Gradually, the

scope of the grants was extended so that at present the requirements for gaining the indulgences are comparatively easy.

HUMANITY OF CHRIST

For the Capuchin friars, too, the Way of the Cross became their principal devotion. Many of the friars were of the spiritual mettle of a Bernard of Fossombrone who, as he meditated on the sufferings of the Crucified Christ, would flee into the woods and weep bitterly. These sons of St. Francis, following the example of St. Felix of Cantalice, who was so touched by the sight of a bloodstained crucifix in the Capuchin monastery at Rieti that he vowed to become a Capuchin and devote his whole life to reflection on the sufferings of Jesus Christ, endeavored to make their lives completely Christocentric. How fitting, then, was it for the Capuchins to propagate this devotion to the Humanity of Christ!

The available data prove that the Capuchins did so. On the island of Sardinia, the friars had erected a Sacred Way of the Cross in the Capuchin convent at Turritana in 1616. Nearly a hundred years later (November 28, 1742), Pope Benedict XIV attached indulgences to these stations. One series of seven stations was erected by the friars at Arlon, Belgium, in 1620. However, they were destroyed in 1681, only to be restored in 1735 with a series of nine

stations. The outstanding Capuchin, Martin of Cochem, popularized a group of stations which greatly resembled the series described by the Carmelite Andrichomius. The Servant of God, Anthony Olivadi, used to erect seven crosses as a Way of the Cross to remind the faithful of Christ's sorrowful journey to Calvary. Later, the Capuchin friar, Bonaventure Barberini, obtained a brief from Pope Clement XII, at the request of Prince Jean Gaston de Medici of Florence, which extended to all Friars Minor the privileges (including the privileges of the Way of the Cross) which originally had been granted to the convent of *Ambrosiana* at Mount Florence.

The principal regions of Capuchin activity in the propagation of this devotion, however, were Spain and Italy. This pious and salutary practice flourished very rapidly in both countries, especially in the former. King Ferdinand VI had received Papal authorization for the Capuchin chapels in his country to enjoy all the spiritual favors attached to the *Via Crucis* devotion. Especially during Lent were the churches crowded with the faithful participating in this exercise. Large numbers of Tertiaries flocked to the chapels. However, because of their limited capacities, the chapels were unable to accommodate the multitudes. This necessitated the practice of starting the exercise inside the building and then continuing

it outside before the assembled throngs. Crosses for each station were erected outside so that all could participate in this salutary devotion. As a fitting conclusion, a friar would deliver an appropriate sermon, and then the people would return to their homes. In July, 1751, Paul of Colindres, at that time Definitor General of the Capuchin Order, received notice from the Holy See that all the faithful who performed the Way of the Cross outdoors in the above manner would gain the same indulgences as those who made it in the usual way.

Whole provinces likewise aided in spreading this devotion. Frequently in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Holy See gave Capuchins the privilege of erecting the stations, heretofore solely reserved to the Friars Minor of the Observance. In 1738, the Province of Switzerland received this favor; later, Bavaria (1746) and the Rhenish Province (1765). The indulgences of the Way of the Cross were granted to the Capuchin churches of the Provinces of Tyrol and Bohemia in 1759, *ut devotio eiusmodi maiora in dies acquirat incrementa* (so that the devotion might enjoy a greater growth from day to day).

Capuchin preachers and writers also contributed their efforts in fostering this devotion. In Italy, the most prominent of these seems to have

been Louis Michael of Cinguli, of the Province of Ancona. Some scholars even attribute the authorship of the *Crucifigatur* formula, a very popular collection of prayers prescribed for making the Stations, to this friar. Among Capuchin writers on this subject, James of Corella, of the Province of Navarre, and Justus of Valencia, of the Province of Valentina, are especially noteworthy. Elsewhere on the continent, mention should be made of the writings of Tiburtius of Innsbruck and Athanasius of Innsbruck, both members of the Tyrolese Province, and Floridus of Burghausen, of the Province of Bavaria. Finally, a missionary in Rhetia, Daniel of Bagnolo (died in 1711), of the Province of Brussels, wrote a series of meditations in the vernacular on the Way of the Cross devotion.

History has acclaimed the *Via Crucis* as a Franciscan devotion. The names of those provinces and friars that we have mentioned in our account of the Capuchin interest in the *Via Crucis* devotion conclusively prove that the Capuchins, too, aided the development and propagation of this exercise. With justifiable pride, the Capuchins can truly boast of playing an important rôle in focusing the attention of the faithful as well as of themselves on that most noble, most realistic and most salutary of devotions, the *Via Crucis*!

Catholic Social Principles on a World Scale

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S.J.

*Address delivered before the Catholic School Press Association,
Milwaukee, Wis., October 28, 1951.*

IT HAS often struck me that Catholics generally, including Catholic journalists, frequently seem to take positions on international affairs and foreign policy without proper regard for the Catholic principles which ought to govern our thinking in this area. The reasons for this non-use of the guide-posts of Catholic thought are probably very simple.

In the first place, can we honestly say that many Catholics, including Catholic journalists, have sufficient background to *know* what the Catholic tradition is in this field? Remember, there is no textbook one can study. A person has to acquire the Catholic attitude, the Catholic feeling, by putting together various elements in Catholic social and political thought. There are certain passages in our philosophers and in Papal documents that bear directly on what one might call a philosophy of international relations. But they are scattered. If you are going to correlate a body of doctrine, you have to see that certain principles which have been explicitly stated and applied to national societies apply just as truly to international society. You

have to make the right inferences, draw the proper conclusions, in order to get a rounded-out Catholic philosophy of internationalism. Relatively few people, so far as I know, have had an opportunity to learn how to do this.

Secondly, in contrast to this scattered and piece-meal assortment of raw materials for a Catholic philosophy, people have at hand rather well worked out philosophies developed from non-Catholic sources. For example, the Hearst press and the *Chicago Tribune* have a philosophy they apply to the international scene 365 days a year. It makes a strong appeal to people imbued with American nationalism, to people who, for one reason or another, harbor a resentment against Great Britain or who dislike "foreigners"—or who simply dislike high taxes. If there is one sentiment common to political mankind, it is an allergy towards taxation. We fought our American Revolution on the issue of unjust taxation. When a man works hard to earn money, he naturally wants to keep it and spend or save it the way he pleases. Although we have serious obligations towards others, we don't like to have

the tax-collector get too explicit about them every time we receive our pay check. Human nature, in other words, has a natural bias toward self-interest. I'm afraid millions and millions of Americans, including many Catholics, shape their views on the world at large pretty much in accordance with feelings as simple as these.

EQUALITY AND COMMON DESTINY OF ALL MEN

From the point of view of a world outlook, if there is one thing clear in Our Lord's message, as recorded by the evangelists, it is that *all men are equal before God*, that they all have the same origin, nature and destiny, that every human being in need is our neighbor, that if we do good only to those who do good to us we are acting like pagans, and that God our Father is interested in *all* His human creatures as His children. These headlines, so to speak, of the "good tidings" cover a lot of ground. In a way, we really do not need much more to guide us in our thinking about international affairs than what Our Lord laid down. How anyone can be a narrow nationalist and still call himself a Christian is more than I can understand.

However, some Catholics probably think that they satisfy the requirements of the Gospel if they take an interest in the *religious* well-being of all mankind. So we had better go into the question of how the basic

truths Our Lord taught us apply to the complicated questions of economic, social, political, military and cultural affairs on a world scale.

This brings us to the natural-law basis of all morality. By and large, Our Lord taught a morality backed up by His divine authority. St. Paul, however, who started writing his inspired letters before the evangelists started recording their inspired accounts, made open reference to the natural law in his *Epistle to the Romans*. He told the Roman philosophers, who thought themselves so wise, that they should have known about God from nature and should have known what was right and what was wrong from the law of their own nature.

This concept of the divine natural law of morality, of human nature itself, properly related to God, to everything in this world and to all human beings, one with another, was not unfolded systematically until Christian philosophers arose. In fact, one can say that no systematic philosophy of the natural law appeared until Christian philosophy itself developed. That didn't take place, in a systematic way, until the medieval universities arose after the emergence of cities only a couple of generations or so before the time of St. Thomas. From that time on (from the thirteenth century, certainly) we have had a carefully worked out body of moral philosophy, based on the na-

tural law, which has very definite implications for international society.

The very idea of natural law is "international." It applies everywhere, to all peoples and to all their relations, among themselves and with all other peoples. One of the worst distortions of the natural law is to limit it to individuals instead of applying it to society—local, national and international. Unfortunately, this distortion seems to be taking place today, in connection (strangely enough) with efforts to *revive* interest in the natural law. People guilty of this distortion do not seem to realize that this excessive *individualism* in the interpretation of natural rights was precisely what killed the natural law in American jurisprudence. Efforts to resurrect it should make sure of its not dying again of anemia from the virus of nineteenth-century liberalism and individualism which doomed it fifty years ago.

CERTAIN RIGHTS

Take the question of *human rights*. We know that every human person, simply by being a human person, enjoys, under God, certain inalienable rights. These rights are intrinsic to the human situation. A person must be free to live, free to decide the most important questions of life for himself, free to acquire the means of carrying out what he understands to be God's purpose in creating him. How else can he work his way back

to God, his Creator? That, after all, is the purpose of human life, the purpose of every single individual person God creates, whether he be a Chinese coolie, a Negro in Rhodesia, an American Indian or anybody else. Unless our thinking about other peoples is governed by this basic Christian philosophy of human life, we are not thinking in Catholic terms about the world at large. This is what we mean by "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Next, let's take the question of *property*, of material goods. We all know that the Church has time and time again vindicated the right of private property as a natural right. This refers primarily to the *right to acquire and own* private goods. But from the time of the earliest Fathers of the Church, Christians have insisted that the *use* of property should be, in considerable degree, *common*. I believe Clement of Alexandria originated this distinction, based on the Gospels: that ownership should be private, but use common. Let me quote briefly from Rev. Victor Cathrein, S.J.'s article on "Property" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* to show that this is still the Church's teaching:

Though private property is a necessity, still the use of earthly goods should in a manner be general. . . . Earthly goods are meant to be, in a certain way, useful to all men. . . . It is the function of a wise government so to direct the laws and administration that a moderate well-being may be shared by as many as possible. . . .

The basis of this idea that the enjoyment of material goods should be distributed as widely as possible is this truth: God created the world and all its resources to satisfy the needs of all mankind.

Now when people criticize the Marshall Plan as a "give-away program," when they label it in derision "operation rat-hole," they are contradicting basic Catholic teaching on the use of material goods. The same goes for the Point Four program, for the grain-to-India bill and similar measures. All these measures, to my mind, are applications of the truth that the rich—including rich nations as well as rich individuals—have a right to private ownership but they have a corresponding duty to use their wealth for the purpose for which God created the material riches of His World, namely, for the benefit of all mankind.

I think a question arises to what extent a state is obliged to exercise the virtue of charity, if it is charity, and not, rather, distributive justice, to those in dire need. We know an *individual* is obliged but is a *state* justified in taxing its citizens in order to be charitable to other peoples? Well, since the people themselves constitute the state, I would say that in a democracy the people, acting through their representatives, could probably go rather far in carrying out the mandate of the natural law to show charity toward those in dis-

tress, at least when the distress is on such a scale that it can be alleviated only by government action. This much is certain: the state can aid other peoples when providing such aid coincides with its own national interests. Since we have to aid them, or decide to aid them, as a means of our own national security, why should a Christian put on a sour face about helping his fellow children of God?

RIGHT TO TAX

The doctrine that the state can use its power to tax in order to promote social justice and the common good has to be extended, I think, to apply on a world scale. The welfare of the peoples of the world is so bound together today that we have to think of social justice and the common good in international terms. For there certainly is an *international common good*, which consists in such peace and security and prosperity as will enable the members of the family of nations to enjoy *domestic* peace and security and prosperity. Lincoln rightly saw that *this nation* could not survive half slave and half free. We see today that *this world of ours* cannot survive half rich and half destitute. It would not be difficult to find such judgments as these scattered through the pronouncements of Pope Pius XII.

Changes have taken place so fast in the past decade that our thinking

is apt to lag far behind them. You all know that the relatively high pay our soldiers and sailors and airmen received in the last war caused great discontent among people with far lower standards of living. The same problem is arising again in General Eisenhower's North Atlantic Treaty forces. Or take an example on a much broader scale: the dissatisfaction of depressed and backward peoples with the destitution they have borne with for centuries. The poor in Japan, China and India and in all colonial or former colonial lands have now seen evidence of or heard about the prosperity of workers and farmers in America. *They are no longer content to live in perpetual destitution. This is an incontrovertible fact. We have to deal with it, or face a future of unending dissension and revolution throughout the world. Our national interests require us to do what we can to raise the standard of living of people everywhere.* Fortunately for us, our national interests rhyme with what our religion teaches us—that Almighty God created the wealth of the world for all mankind, not merely for those who, for various reasons, were the first to learn how to exploit it and happened to settle in regions where nature is bountiful.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The human race is, in Catholic doctrine, *one human race*. We have all descended from the same first par-

ents. Our doctrine of original sin itself shows dramatically the extent to which all human beings on this earth form a *moral unity*. We have mutual rights and duties, not only to those we know, those who live in our neighborhood, our city, our state, our nation, but to *all men*. The *Declaration of Independence* set our thinking on the right track when it underlined the truth that "*all men are created equal*" and "*are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights . . .*" The peoples of the world, therefore, although they are organized in national states, nevertheless form *one international society*.

What does this mean? What is a "society"?

A society is what the philosophers call a "moral unity" of persons banded together for a common purpose to be achieved according to agreed-upon means. Taking society in its broadest sense and leaving aside such groups as debating societies or your own Catholic Student Press Association, the "great" societies of this world are mostly politically organized. This city of Milwaukee is such a society, the State of Wisconsin is such a society, the United States of America is such a society. The scholastics used an old term, somewhat ambiguous, I am afraid, to describe them: *civil societies*.

Now why do we have such "civil societies"? Because the people in

them depend on each other. They are social by nature. They have many needs which can only be satisfied by cooperation on a municipal, State and national scale. Such needs include self-protection, law and order, an educational system, orderly transaction of commercial enterprises to satisfy men's material wants, and hosts of others.

Mankind also has needs which cannot be satisfied by local, regional or even national cooperation. Take natural resources, for example: let's say oil. Oil is found only in certain areas, yet all people need it to some extent. The same is true of coal, timber, various types of agricultural products, metals and so on down the list. As a result, mankind as a whole must have orderly means of cooperation in trade, in shipping and other forms of transportation, and so on. Commerce, indeed, has woven the threads of an international society. But so have immigration, religion, science, medicine, literature (for example, the law of international copyright) and recreation. There is not the slightest doubt, no matter how cynics may pooh-pooh the notion of "one world," that all the peoples of the earth are so interdependent today as to form, in a real sense, a world society. The American Bishops recognized this fact in their November, 1944, NCWC statement: "There is an international community of nations. God Himself has made the nations interdependent

for their full life and growth" (*Catholic Mind*, January, 1945, p. 2).

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

Now we come to the rub. "It is not therefore a question of creating an international community," continued the Bishops, "but of organizing it." They had reference to the *political* organization of the world community. The urgent need of an effective *international* political society is proven above all by the urgent need to put an end to suicidal wars between *national* political societies.

The concept of an international political organization (in a sense, but a very limited sense, a "world state") is one of the oldest dreams of mankind. The idea kept bobbing up in connection with "the law of nations," *ius gentium*, or what we more often term "international law," which goes back to the Roman Empire.

Let me just quote a little from Francis Suarez, the great Catholic political philosopher of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century (d. 1617). Writing on the *ius gentium*, Suarez declared:

The rational basis, moreover, of this phase of law consists in the fact that the human race, into howsoever many different peoples and kingdoms it may be divided, always preserves a certain unity, not only as a species, but also as a moral and political unity (as it were) enjoined by the natural precept of mutual love and mercy; a precept which applies to all, even to strangers of every nation.

Therefore, although a given sovereign state, commonwealth, or kingdom may constitute a perfect community in itself, consisting of its own members, nevertheless, each one of these states is also, in a certain sense, and viewed in relation to the human race, a member of that universal society. For these states when standing alone are never so self-sufficient that they do not require some mutual assistance, association and intercourse, at times for their own greater welfare and advantage, but at other times also because of some moral necessity or need. This fact is also made manifest by actual usage.

Consequently, such communities have need of some system of law whereby they may be directed and properly ordered with regard to this kind of intercourse and association. And although that guidance is in large measure provided by natural reason, it is not provided in sufficient measure and in a direct manner with respect to all matters. Therefore it is possible for certain special rules of law to be introduced through the practice of these same nations. (*Classics of International Law, Selections from Three Works of Francisco Suarez, S.J.* (ed. James Brown Scott). Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1944, Vol. II, pp. 348-9. Italics added.)

What Suarez was saying, of course, was that the national state was not, even in his day, really a perfect society because it did not perfectly fulfill men's political needs. So revolutionary have been the changes in international life in this century that we may say without fear of contradiction: much of what the older scholastics wrote about the "natural" need of the state applies today to

some kind of international political organization of mankind.

This brings us to our final problem, which concerns the *type* of world political organization. Let us assume that the United Nations represents at best only a half-way house towards what the world needs. Few who accept the principles already outlined would question such an assumption.

WORLD FEDERALISM

To be very brief about it, the only solution possible must take the form of a *federal* world state. I know full well that "world federalism" has been a fighting term among large numbers of Catholics. The federalist ideal, as a matter of fact, got bogged down in a controversy over a side issue. An extremely conservative (or, rather, reactionary,) group in New York City "discovered" that an association working for world federalism had been infiltrated by Communists. Through a gross misunderstanding, the *idea* of world federalism was dubbed "Red" in the Hearst and other—not excluding sections of the Catholic—press.

To a political scientist, however, the only feasible and workable type of world political organization must unquestionably be federal in form. Whether or not Communists infiltrated groups sponsoring world federalism, it could be proved very easily that Russia adamantly opposes this political form, either in the Bal-

kans or on a world scale. The opponents of world federalism, as a matter of fact, echoed the Soviet position when they came forward as the exponents of unmitigated national sovereignty.

Pope Pius XII has brought this wholly unnecessary controversy to an end. At least we can hope so. In his address on April 6, 1951, to delegates to the fourth congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government meeting in Rome, he said: "We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart We pray to God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task." If this is not a blessing upon the movement for world federalism, it is hard to see how the Holy Father, who chooses words prudently, could have phrased a blessing.

CONCLUSION

You students and faculty representatives in the Catholic Student Press Association have a heavy responsibility. I know from my own experiences how difficult Catholic journalism is. It requires a much wider background than secular journalism. In addition, it exacts the same professional qualifications. Moreover, the world in which we live and write is hopelessly at sixes and sevens. The factual information a journalist has

to have at his command today is terrifying.

Yet it is to the world of today—not of yesterday, or even of tomorrow—that we are called. Thanks to the gift of divine faith, we are spared the confusions and doubts of our secular colleagues. We have a philosophy of life and a world outlook that can welcome and find a place for every truth. We have nothing to be afraid of, so long as we are sincere, industrious and humble. We have not staked our hopes on the shifting sands of ideologies. We know in Whom we have believed, and that in Him, and with Him and through Him we can do all things commanded us. We know better than to bury ourselves so deep in our typewriters as to forget that this is God's world, that He has a divine plan for it and that plan, through His infinitely wise, powerful and loving Providence, will govern the shape of things to come.

We are not afraid, I say—even of death itself. Only one thing counts: that we do our best. We are not looking for an earthly city, contrived by the hands and minds of men, but one that is above, whose maker and founder is God. Let us never forget that, so that we may keep our writing about this world of time in tune with the mind and will of Him who created it and peopled it with such imperfect human creatures as ourselves.

Union-Employer Relations

JOSEPH P. FITZPATRICK, S.J.

*A letter to the NEW YORK TIMES**

I WAS quite amazed to read the enthusiastic endorsement of an unsound principle of unionism in your editorial "Police and the People" on September 11.

You commended as "clear thinking" the following remarks of George L. Stemmler: "Inherent in the concept of a union is the idea of a group separate and apart and, in a sense, antagonistic to its employer . . . The labor union has, as the very essence of its being, the basic principle that the rights of its members are in contraposition to the rights and interests of the employer and that its members must band together for concerted action against the employer." In your commendation of this position you evidently propose it as the context in which we should face the problem of police unions.

CLASS CONFLICT

Now this statement of Mr. Stemmler comes very close to the Marxist theory that labor organizations represent, as the very essence of their being, a form of class warfare, a basic antagonism between the interests of employer and employe which can never be reconciled. Concerted action against the employer is the principle of their existence.

These principles of class conflict are quite foreign to the principles on which a democratic industrial society must be based. Theoretically in such a society, the primary purpose of all industry is the service of society, and the cooperation of employer and employe in this predominant interest should unite them, not divide them.

But even in fact the labor union has been an instrument of cooperation much more than an instrument of conflict. For it is commonly recognized that, in our highly complicated system of industries and organizations, the individual becomes lost and helpless. Only some form of organization enables him to contribute his work to a corporation with a sense of freedom and independence, enables him to participate with a sense of human dignity in the great decisions that affect his own life and the welfare of society.

* 229 W. 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y., Sept. 14, 1951.

Thus the labor union enables the workingman to become a much more responsible citizen both inside the industry and out of it. Many a manager of a large corporation will affirm that he could not operate effectively if he did not have a union competently representing his men.

The recurrent conflict of unions and management does not invalidate this principle of cooperation. Neither does the right to strike. Granted that the facts of industrial life seem often far removed from this ideal of cooperative enterprise, nevertheless the principles guiding our approach to these matters are most important. If we dismiss the principle of essential cooperation and resort to principles of essential antagonism, we are lost—as lost as any Marxist society is lost—in class conflict.

It is unfortunate that the *New York Times* has thus further confused the difficult problem of police unions by suggesting that we approach the problem with an unsound principle of unionism. This is not consistent with many of your other editorials on the question.

The issue at stake in this problem is the need of our policemen to develop an organization that will enable them to serve the community more effectively; but which will also provide a system in which the community will effectively fulfill its own obligations to its faithful employees. If this organization should not be the Transport Workers Union, then let argument proceed on that basis. The presence of Mr. Quil, President of TWU, should not prompt us to interpret all union-employer relationships in terms of class conflict.



Scale of Values

Nothing is more pathetic these days than the spectacle of a man seeking his happiness in the abundance and determination of material things, and forgetting that joy, satisfaction, rest and salvation are all questions of the spirit. Surely economic and social injustice is a grievous thing, but there is such a thing as intellectual injustice, spiritual injustice, moral injustice, where people live in darkness and rebellion and falsehood; and *this* injustice, *this* violation of one's own humanity, whether perpetrated by oneself or by one's fellows, is infinitely more grievous. The establishment of the proper hierarchy in human rights, the determination of those rights for the sake of which other rights, if need be, must be joyfully sacrificed, this task is as urgent today as the mere enumeration of human rights as a whole.—*Charles Malik in the COMMONWEAL, October 12, 1951.*

From Chalcedon to Today

BY THE EDITORS

Reprinted from THE TABLET*

IN THE reckoning of years, it is a far cry to the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Save in the integrated, continuous life of the Church, there is nothing living and to be commemorated, except for pageantry, or for antiquarian or commercial reasons, out of the centuries of the Roman Empire. When, two years ago, the Danes sought to commemorate an event that happened about the same time as the Council of Chalcedon, the arrival of Hengist and Horsa in the Isle of Thanet, so unreal and flippant was the whole proceeding that the Saxons from Frisia were cheerfully confused with the Northmen and the Viking vessels of three centuries later. But the Council of Chalcedon is part of the warp and woof of the seamless robe of the historical life of the Church. Its definitions are still living directives, and there is nothing strained or artificial when its fifteenth centenary is commemorated with the Encyclical *Sempiternus Rex*, in which the successor of St. Peter today takes up again subjects which the Council treated.

It was a Council held, like so many of the early Councils, in the Eastern Mediterranean, among peoples since

lost to the Catholic unity; and very fittingly it was Cardinal Agagianian, the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia, who sang in Rome the first commemorative Mass. Much of the Encyclical turns on the unity of the Church, because the descendants of those who played such a great part at Chalcedon have been estranged for more than half of the intervening period. Yet at Chalcedon they met in a world in which heresy and schism had long been familiar evils. From the time of the Apostles heresy and schism had been known, and the greatest importance attached to visible unity, so that those who had known St. John the Apostle, who related how in his old age he reiterated the commandment to men to love one another, could also relate how he fled from the baths at Ephesus as soon as he heard that the heretic Celsus was there. The separated brethren of the Levant today, all that Greek world which contributed so much to the articulation of the Catholic Faith in the early centuries, to the formulation of the difficult orthodox doctrine of the nature of Our Lord, are today overshadowed.

It is one of the long, slow ironies of history that the Orthodox separa-

* 1:8 Sloane St., London, S.W. 1, England, Sept. 22, 1951.

tion from Rome came out of a political tradition of Cæsaro-Papism which, in the fullness of time, ended as a more complete domination of religion by the State than Christianity has known elsewhere. It is still in the long memory of the Church that the two great moments when unity was nearly re-established, in the thirteenth century and in the fifteenth, were times of military peril, from the Mongol and the Turk; menaces in front of which the Eastern Christians made up their quarrel with the West, as, in the face of a much more efficiently organized enemy, they are urged to do today.

It may well be thought that the later heresies have had a great advantage over the earlier, because the Catholic Church has grown, century by century, in the fullness of its life; so that the Protestants of the sixteenth century had a much greater inheritance of doctrine and worship than the Aryans of the fourth, and could live for a longer time on what they retained; had, for instance, a fuller sense of ecclesiastical order. The Church was so great a reality, inside which men had lived so wholeheartedly and intensely for fifteen hundred years, that not only the national Churches of the Reformation, but the sects, the Free Churches, grew with a notion of the Church which could not fail to be a Catholic inheritance, however much of Catholic doctrine and practice was rejected.

Chalcedon is, with Nicæa, Constantinople and Ephesus, one of the first four General Councils which were at one time commonly, if arbitrarily, selected by Protestants as in their pedigree, in a way later Councils were not; because the appeal to the primitive Church and to Scripture rested on the idea that what was earliest was best, as though it had not been the great essential function of these Councils to clarify and establish what had previously been subject to debate and challenge, so that some of the most fantastic hypotheses about the nature of Christ were advanced in the second century.

CHURCH DIVINELY GUIDED

The great idea behind all the Councils was the idea that the Church is divinely guided, because divinely commissioned to teach, having authority; and it is the disappearance of this idea in the Protestant world through the two stages, the attempt to substitute the Bible for the Church, followed by the undermining of the Bible, which is a main reason for the extreme intellectual and moral confusion which, by this century, is rampant in the countries of Protestant Christianity. Much of this confusion comes from the perverse modern habit of arbitrarily assuming that the human race must go forward from its errors and must on no account retrace any of its steps. And it is part of the value of commemorating a

Council of fifteen hundred years ago that it can light up in a flash what the wanderings of the peoples have been, doctrinal and moral wanderings of much profounder significance than the physical wanderings of the peoples which were troubling Western Europe in the century of Chalcedon.

VICTORIAN RATIONALISM

For a thousand years from Chalcedon the life of the Church was the life of the European peoples. It is only in the five hundred years since, in the last third of the whole period, that the aberrations have been increasingly violent and far-reaching, and that men have conjured into existence new forms of being, have reimagined themselves and the universe, have made of some political or economic program the creed and the key to explain the meaning of life. They reached a point in the nineteenth century when the whole business of Christian theology could seem a most unfortunate blind alley, down which the intellect and vitality of the Dark and Middle Ages had lost itself, to the great retarding of human progress in the practical sciences. It can be counted as one of the gains of this century that men no longer share that Victorian rationalism, or consider theology irrelevant, and human progress easier to be secured without it.

Man is by nature religious, seeking to bind himself, and the question is,

what is the true religion to which his allegiance is owing and what are the false religions with which he will destroy himself. This is now seen to be the true way of stating the human dilemma, and the rationalist attempt to represent the choice as one between superstition and reason to be one that does not state or clarify the real issue at all. The reason thus advocated was, in fact, quite an arbitrary selection of values, made by men moulded and dominated by Christian doctrines enshrined in the society which gave them birth.

HISTORICAL MEMORY

The intimate interconnection of men, the way they are involved in each other's actions, the interdependence of the chain of human generations—all this is partly preserved in the traditions and pride of old nations, and is most vividly presented to the human imagination in the life and practices of the Church, where the historical memory is so sedulously and piously cultivated, with a clear sense that the effects of human actions are vastly greater than at first sight appears, that for good or ill in the human story the acts of individuals carry a weight and a responsibility not to be imagined; so that the rejoicing and the gratitude for the lives and works of the saints is altogether inadequate for what is being praised.

Such an event as Chalcedon, coming out of one of the continual chal-

lenges through which doctrine has been little by little defined, is normal to the life of the Church militant. It is also normal that the Holy Father in 1951 should be calling to those in the East long separated from the

Church to undo the errors and mistakes of fifteen hundred years before; in the spirit of Pascal's great dictum, that "we are not commanded to see that the Faith prevails, but only to struggle that it should."



Alger Hiss and the Liberals

In the end Hiss failed all liberals, all who had, in some sense and at some time, shared his illusions (and who that calls himself a liberal is exempt?), all who demanded of him that he speak aloud a common recognition of complicity. And yet, perhaps they did not really want him to utter a confession; it would have been enough had he admitted a mistake rather than confessed a positive evil. Maybe, at the bottom of their hearts, they did not finally want him to admit anything, but preferred the chance he gave them to say: he is, we are, innocent.

American liberalism has been reluctant to leave the garden of its illusion; but it can dally no longer: the age of innocence is dead. The Hiss case marks the death of an era, but it also promises a rebirth if we are willing to learn its lessons. We who would still like to think of ourselves as liberals must be willing to declare that mere liberal principle is not in itself a guarantee against evil; that the wrongdoer is not always the other—"they" and not "us"; that there is no magic in the words "left" or "progressive" or "socialist" that can prevent deceit and the abuse of power.

It is not necessary that we liberals be self-flagellants. We have desired good, and we have done some; but we have also done great evil. The confession in itself is nothing, but without the confession there can be no understanding, and without the understanding of what the Hiss case tries desperately to declare, we will not be able to move forward from a liberalism of innocence to a liberalism of responsibility.—*Leslie A. Fiedler in COMMENTARY, August, 1951.*

Tragedy of the Baltic States

HON. EDWARD M. O'CONNOR

Commissioner, Displaced Persons Commission

*An address delivered at the Balkan Freedom Rally, New York, N. Y.,
June 16, 1951.*

IT IS my happy privilege and honor to be here with you this evening to take a part in the program commemorating the tenth anniversary of one of the gravest crimes against humanity. It was just ten years ago that the Soviet Union began the first mass deportations of Baltic nationals to the slave-labor camps invented and maintained by the Communist regime. Ten years is a very short period of time in the course of history, but it can be an eternity to any freedom-loving people who are forced into abject slavery by a cruel and predatory regime. Since those tragic days of ten years ago, many other nations have fallen victims to the Red pattern of world conquest, additional millions of innocent people have been deported to the infamous slave-labor camps of the Soviet Union, and today the masters of the Kremlin seek to complete their plan by destroying or subjugating the remaining free nations and independent peoples.

In these circumstances, I believe the most fitting tribute I can pay to those patriotic citizens of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania who were de-

ported to a living death in the Soviet Union, is to recall to public notice some of the facts surrounding the Baltic Republics before, during and immediately following World War II. These facts should serve as an added warning to freedom-loving people everywhere that unless free nations and people unite and remain united, their liberties and opportunities will be torn from them and they too will be reduced to slavery.

The Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania came into being as independent states after World War I. Because they rest on the shores of the Baltic Sea, Americans commonly refer to these Republics as the Baltic States. It is estimated that the 1940 population of these states was just short of 6,000,000 people. The peoples of these respective states have a particular and distinctive culture, tradition and rich folklore. The spirit of independence is their common and strong characteristic. In the building of these states, their people were imbued with a real idealism for the complete accomplishment of the basic democratic principles. They pro-

ceeded on the principle that "the power of the state is in the hands of the people." In many other important essentials they sought to pattern their way of life along the lines which govern our great democracy.

TOTALITARIAN DICTATORSHIP

History records that these republics had to fight for their independence, which, when won, required great courage, ingenuity and vigilance to maintain. Nevertheless, they prospered as peaceful members of the family of nations. In 1939, they were caught between the powerful pincers of totalitarian dictatorship. In this year of world crisis and decision, the Soviet Union entered into a Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation with Nazi Germany. The secret protocols of this treaty (since made public) carved out spheres of influence for each of the dictators, agreed to certain transfers of then independent territory, and laid out the grand scheme for the eventual liquidation of the independent European states including the Baltic Republics. It was this same evil instrument which destroyed the balance then preventing a world war, thus permitting Nazi Germany to invade Poland.

It is quite common knowledge in the United States that within a few days after the Nazis invaded Poland from the west, the Soviets invaded Poland from the east. The Soviets

then claimed this action a defensive one, but events since then clearly prove this action grew out of the secret protocols of the Nazi-Soviet Treaty, and was meant to be a permanent reordering of the Soviet frontier. A different approach was made at that time in respect to the Baltic States, but one which nevertheless had the same ultimate purpose of extending the Soviet frontiers.

On September 18, 1939, the day following the Soviet invasion of Poland, the Kremlin opened a psychological offensive against the Baltic States. A public charge was made that Polish submarines had taken refuge in naval bases belonging to the Baltic States with the connivance of the ruling circles. Charge after charge of a similar character followed while simultaneously large detachments of the Red Army were moved up to the frontiers separating the Soviet Union from the Baltic States. When the Russians felt their intended aggression had been rationalized by their false propaganda, they began a diplomatic offensive.

Little Estonia was selected as the first victim. The Foreign Minister of Estonia was summoned to Moscow to sign—not negotiate—a Russo-Estonian Pact of Mutual Assistance. This pact was loaded with clauses calculated to justify the crude Soviet duplicity which has only in recent years been exposed in its true light to world opinion. Article 5 of the

pact stated in part, "The fulfillment of this pact must not affect in any measure the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, in particular their economic systems and state organizations." On the other hand, the pact also granted the Soviet Union the right to maintain naval and air bases and armed forces of limited strength on Estonian territory.

Latvia and Lithuania were next on the list. The Foreign Ministers of these Republics were ordered to Moscow to sign—and I repeat, not to negotiate—what the Kremlin called mutual assistance pacts. The provisions of these pacts were identical as to the loaded clauses and guaranties of sovereignty they contained, but differed in some other minor respects.

PRELUDE TO ENSLAVEMENT

Now let us see what devious use the Kremlin made of these mutual assistance pacts. Soon after the signing, Red troops were sent into all three Republics. Then a series of manufactured incidents began to occur. Claims were made that Red soldiers were insulted, kidnaped, killed. Pro-Soviet demonstrations were organized by skillful agents. Patriotic gatherings were called threats to the security of the Soviets. This stage was followed by a rapid build-up of Red Army divisions stationed in the Baltic States. Then came the final charge—that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania had entered into a

secret military alliance of their own which was directed against the Soviet Union. The ultimatum of the Soviets which followed demanded: 1) that the governments be dissolved and that new governments be established; 2) the completely free access for Red troops to the Baltic States. On June 14, 1940, Lithuania received this ultimatum and two days later, on June 16, 1940, Estonia and Latvia received similar notice. At the same time these formalities were being observed, strong Soviet forces were already crossing the Baltic frontiers. Within a few days the Soviets completely overran these territories.

Now let us turn to the next chapter in this tragedy. Since the legal governments had been dissolved, it was necessary to establish new governments. It was here the Kremlin first demonstrated its peculiar methods of conducting democratic elections in formerly independent states. With an armed force of over 2,000,000 men stationed in the territories, elections were ordered for July 14, 1940, in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Three high agents of the Kremlin were dispatched to organize these so-called elections: General Zhdanov to Estonia, Dekanozov to Lithuania, and Andrei Vyshinsky to Latvia. The pattern they applied has since been used many times since the end of World War II: one printed list of selected candidates was put up for vote; it was declared illegal to write in the

names of any other candidates; everyone was obliged to vote; the voting took place in public and without benefit of secret ballot.

The Union of the Toiling People thus won unanimous victories in each of these elections. People's parliaments were set up in each of the Baltic Republics. On July 21, 1940, these kangaroo parliaments met in separate sessions, but each one declared by acclamation the annexation of their state to the Soviet Union. On August 1, that same year, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. was called into special session, and soon thereafter admitted the states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to the U.S.S.R. Thus closed another chapter in the Red pattern for world conquest.

But what was the fate of these liberty-loving people after the Soviets had completed their illegal annexations? Former officials, merchants, bankers, professors, army officers and political leaders were singled out as enemies of the people. To deal with them the agents of the Kremlin set up peoples courts with the power to sentence these leaders to death, and their families and relatives to ten years in prison. By decree, the land, the banks and all commercial enterprises were nationalized. There followed ever-increasing persecution of the people because they refused to cooperate with the imposed Communist regime. Individual deportation of dissidents to the inner reaches of

the Soviet Union was carried out by the GPU.

MASS DEPORTATIONS

Then came the fateful days of June 14, 15 and 16, 1941. The Soviets, mindful that the honeymoon of the dictators would soon terminate, began their brutal and criminal mass deportations of Baltic nationals. Dragnets were put out for all persons considered to be of the intelligentsia class, or persons who were openly hostile to the Communist movement, or persons with any skills helpful to the restoration of independent republics, and the remaining leaders in all walks of life. These man-hunts went on for days—twenty-four hours a day. On June 22, 1941, the honeymoon of the dictators ended, and Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union, driving the Soviets out of the Baltic States within a matter of days thereafter. Before their departure, however, the mass deportation of approximately 200,000 anti-Communist nationals of the three Baltic States had been accomplished. Thus, what had taken more than a decade to achieve in Soviet Russia, the agents of the Kremlin sought to accomplish in the course of a few days—the liquidation of each and every actual or potential political opponent.

Some people may ask: "Why this particular vengeance against the people of the Baltic States, and just what happened to these deportees

after their arrival in the Soviet Union?" The particular type of vengeance visited upon the Baltic States resulted from their inbred hatred of Communism and their well-known opposition to the aims of the Kremlin for world conquest. The masters of the Kremlin were well prepared to receive the 200,000 Baltic deportees. They were well prepared because of their long experience in the treatment and utilization of slave labor. The slave-labor system of the Soviets is an integral and essentially important part of their social system and over-all economy.

SLAVE LABOR

Estimates of the number of human beings held in slave-labor camps within the Soviet Union range from 15,000,000 to 30,000,000. One former high official of the Kremlin who became disillusioned and escaped to the free world has stated that Soviet official estimates put the figure at 20,000,000 people. It is becoming increasingly clear that the entire structure of the Soviet Union is built upon and maintained by various classes of human slaves. The Communist theoreticians are seeking to prove that capital is not necessary to an economic system. They are substituting human slaves for capital because manpower to them has no meaning other than what it can produce for the state. The much-publicized five-year plans have in major part been predicated

on the population of the slave-labor camps and a speculation on how many additional millions of slave laborers will become available during the period of the plan. Most of the major development programs in the Soviet Union, such as the building of new roads and inland canals, the development of hydroelectric power, the sinking and working of mines, have counted upon the labors of these slaves.

The masses of the Russian people are in a class only slightly above the millions held in slave-labor camps. Some students of this problem have said that only the masters of the Kremlin and their elite functionaries are free from the toils of the slave-labor system. I do not find myself in agreement with this thesis because I believe that they too have become slaves of the monster they have created, that they live in constant fear of the day when even their most oppressive and criminal actions will fail to keep the lid on their evil system.

What lessons can we as good Americans learn from these sad historic facts which have been put before you this evening. I should like to enumerate a few of the lessons I fear we must learn, and learn well, if the free world is to survive:

1. That all free nations and people must unite and intensify the present efforts toward attainment of a common security to turn back the enveloping red shadow of world conquest.

2. That the stronger the free world becomes and the more vigorous its opposition to the predatory schemes of the Kremlin, the greater will the opportunities be for the subjugated peoples to express their determination for freedom.

3. That so long as millions of human beings are deprived of their God-given rights and held in abject slavery, we may not attain that peaceful world toward which we now direct our wholehearted efforts.

4. That the day is long past when a few strong men can sit around a conference table and settle the future and fate of smaller nations. We have entered an era of world affairs in which the principle of self-determination may no longer be denied the subjugated peoples of the world—they must be allowed to work out their own peaceful destinies in the spirit of freedom for all men for all time.

5. That the masters of the Kremlin and their elite functionaries are guilty of a long list of crimes against humanity, and the day is inevitable when they must be tried for these crimes before a world tribunal of justice.

The Government of the United States, expressing the clear will of the American people, has taken, and will continue to take, all measures necessary to the attainment of a peaceful world with freedom and justice for all. It has taken steps to strengthen free nations everywhere

in their struggle for survival; it has met force with force in resisting the predatory advances of Communism; it has entered into collective-security arrangements with other free nations; it has established programs to assist in the rehabilitation of victims of Communist aggression, and it will continue these efforts until the victory of peace is won.

It has been my privilege to play some part in the American plan for world peace. Through the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was amended last year by Congress, the United States is providing a haven for over 400,000 victims of totalitarian aggression. The displaced persons and expellees admitted to the United States under this program once again are able to enjoy the basic liberties and unlimited opportunities of the American way of life. The American people have welcomed these newcomers to their ranks as freemen.

I am happy to report to you that as of April 30, 1951, 59,436 Baltic nationals have been brought into the United States under this program. Of this number, 29,599 were from Latvia, 21,191 from Lithuania, and 8,646 from Estonia. I am confident that before this program is completed, additional thousands of Baltic nationals will enter the United States and thereafter enjoy fully the God-given rights of men which have made the American way of life the symbol of peace, prosperity and freedom.

Gregorian Masses

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from THE PILOT**

THE Gregorian Masses derive their name from Pope St. Gregory I (590-604). This Pope, who had been Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of S. Andrew, in Rome, was conspicuous for his devotion to the Holy Souls. In his book of Dialogues (IV, c.55) he relates that upon the death of a certain monk named Justus he gave orders to another monk, Pretiosus, to have Mass celebrated in the monastery for the soul of Justus on thirty consecutive days. On the day on which the last of the thirty Masses was celebrated, Gregory continues, still another monk, Copiosus, claimed that Justus appeared to him and announced that he had just been freed from the sufferings of Purgatory. The obvious conclusion was that the thirty Masses had been effective in procuring the release of Justus.

Gradually the practice thus initiated by Pope St. Gregory came to be followed by others. As early as the eighth century it was fairly common. It has received the approval of several Popes, notably Benedict XIII (1724-1730) and Benedict XIV (1740-1758). In 1884 the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences declared that the confidence of the faithful in the efficacy of the Gregorian Masses is pious and reasonable and that the custom of celebrating these Masses may be regarded as having the approval of the Church.

These official pronouncements do not indicate that the Church has recognized the story of the monk Justus as historically accurate. Nor do they constitute any sort of guarantee or infallible promise that a soul for whom Gregorian Masses are offered has been saved, or that it will be released from Purgatory once the Masses have been said. Moreover, no special indulgences, apart from those otherwise attached to the Masses which are celebrated, have been decreed for the Gregorian Masses. On the other hand, the attitude of the Church towards the Gregorian Masses affords justification for confidence in the intercession of Pope St. Gregory in favor of souls for whom they may be offered, and thus for the hope that their stay in Purgatory may be greatly shortened, if not at once terminated.

* 49 Franklin St., Boston 10, Mass., July 8, 1950.

It is essential for the Gregorian Masses that they be celebrated on thirty consecutive days and that each series of Gregorian Masses be offered for a single soul, not for two or more souls. The series need not all be said by the same priest, but the priest who assumes the obligation must make certain that the series, once begun, is not interrupted. On the last three days of Holy Week, when private Masses are forbidden, a series of Gregorian Masses is not broken; but a priest who is carrying through such a series and who happens to celebrate Mass on Holy Thursday or Holy Saturday should offer his Mass for his Gregorian intention.

A priest who culpably fails to complete, or have completed, a series of Gregorian Masses for which he has held himself responsible must begin the series all over again and carry it through to completion. If a priest has begun a series of Gregorian Masses and, through no fault of his own, is unable to arrange for its consecutive completion, he may, according to a solidly probable opinion, supply at the earliest possible moment the Masses which have been omitted. In this case he should endeavor to say at least one Mass on a privileged altar for the soul for whom the series is being offered, or to gain in some other way a plenary indulgence which will be applicable to this soul.



Marriage is Teamwork

Marriage is no mistake. It involves a gamble, a risk and a good or a bad choice, but once a marriage is made, it's *the* way to God. He wants us—and He will have us, if only we will have Him. If I were to be limited to one rule on spirituality for the married, it would be to remember that no matter how tough it can be, how lonely at times, how unhappy, it can never be a solo flight—you've got to do it together.—*Mary Redd Newland in INTEGRITY, October, 1951.*



King of Creation

To the Christian or, more broadly, to the believer, man is the only important thing on earth. And man is important only because he is made in God's image and destined for immortality. Everything else is important in the exact measure in which it helps man fulfill the purposes God has appointed for him.—*Louis J. Twomey, S.J., in the QUEEN'S WORK, October, 1951.*

Moral Aspects of Industrial Relations

GERALD KELLY, S.J.

*Reprinted from THEOLOGICAL STUDIES**

AN expert in the field of industrial relations told me that in his opinion the most memorable publication of the year is the pastoral letter entitled *The Problem of the Worker in the Light of the Social Doctrine of the Church*.¹ This letter was issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Civil Province of Quebec under date of February 14, 1950. The authorized English version has 204 paragraphs and 106 reference notes. It completely covers the field of the workers' problem as it exists in the civil province of Quebec; it describes the problem itself, and carefully explains the principles and methods by which the problem is to be solved. From the bewildering number of excellent points that it covers, I am selecting only these three for special mention here: the statement on the Christian concept of work, the duty of joining a union, and the practical determination of the living wage.

Eleven paragraphs of the letter are

devoted to the Christian concept of work (57-67.)² The bishops censure big business for giving the machine the primacy over the laborer and thus inverting God's plan for industrial work. In the divine plan, work, being a domination of matter, is creative: the worker "continues in some way the work of creation by transforming and by rendering useful the created goods which have been put at his disposal by God, in order that he may attain his proper end." Work is also a service to humanity, as well as a means of developing and enriching the human personality of the worker. Finally, on the supernatural level, work done by one in the state of grace and with a right intention is a meritorious, redemptive service of God.

The effort that he [the worker] expends, the trouble that he undergoes in working, makes a man a sharer in the mystery of redemptive suffering. Then, too, in the desire of serving others, by his work, man finds an opportunity of

¹ The English version is published by Palm Publishers, Montreal, and is distributed in the United States by America Press, New York. For a good survey of the letter, see "Canadian Bishops on the Life of the Worker," by Benjamin L. Masse, S.J., *America*, LXXXIII (1950), 137-39; 171-72; 211-14.

² For another recent study of the meaning of work, see "Le Sens catholique du travail et de la civilisation," by A. de Bovis, S.J., *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXXII (1950), 357-71; 468-78.

* Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md., March, 1951.

practising the commandment that Christ gave us of loving one another, of aiding one another. The whole of Tradition has recognized this Christian value of work, symbolized by the Divine Worker of Nazareth.

The farmer and artisan can easily realize in their work all its possibilities of human betterment and supernatural merit. It is otherwise for the industrial worker and for the majority of wage earners. For this saying of Pius XI is still true of too many: "from the factory dead matter goes out improved, whereas men there are corrupted and degraded."³ Furthermore, the modern technique of production has led to a more marked separation between Capital and Labor, and has been the cause of many misunderstandings and conflicts. It is the rediscovered meaning of work and of its ends that will correct this deplorable situation, and re-establish order in professional relations. . . .

That the bishops are as much at home in offering practical rules as in expounding Christian theory is manifested by this realistic statement concerning the determination of the just wage: "In the present labour conditions, the collective agreement, negotiated with a free union, may be considered as the normal means of deciding on the just wage; the means, however, would cease to be legitimate if the agreement were the result of undue pressure." They do not suggest this as a permanent working rule. They visualize something better as the restoration of the social order

moves on, and they express the hope that through meetings of mutual confidence employers and employed may discover means of "bettering the old and finding new formulas of remuneration."⁴

FUNCTION OF UNIONS

In the section on the workers' duties in the restoration of a Christian social order the letter has much to say about the nature and function of labor unions. And it insists not only on the right to join a union but on the duty of so doing:

Every man has the duty to see that all his professional interests are protected and secure. He has the duty to aim at obtaining for himself and his family all that is necessary to lead a truly human life, sheltered against the chances of the future. He has the duty to co-operate for the welfare of his fellow-citizens, especially those to whom he is united by common interests. He has the duty to collaborate for the restoration of a more balanced social order by favoring the respect of justice in all the activities of labor, industry and commerce. The isolated worker cannot achieve this. United with his fellow-workers, he will be able to perform that imperious social duty. In the present state of things, therefore, there is a moral obligation to take an active part in the professional organization.

This strong statement differs considerably from the opinion of some moralists that the duty of joining a union is present only in exceptional

³ *Quadragesimo Anno*, Paulist Press edition, par. 153.

⁴ Cf. the pastoral letter, n. 131.

circumstances.⁵ In favor of the latter it might be argued that in Quebec there are Catholic unions, whereas in the United States the workers cannot be sure their unions are conducted according to sound principles. In view of the recent Labor Day Statement of the Social Action Department of the NCWC,⁶ I would question the validity of this defence. It seems to me that the arguments of the Quebec hierarchy are as pertinent in this and other countries as they are in Canada and that the duty of joining a union is the normal thing rather than the exception. John F. Cronin, S.S., clearly outlines the pros and cons of this question.⁷ His own speculative position seems to be definitely on the side of the obligation to join a union, but his practical conclusion is ambiguous: he thinks we should explain to workers the necessity of the union for their protection and the common good but we should not insist on the personal obligation under pain of sin.

THE LIVING WAGE

L'ami du Clergé presents an interesting case on the living wage.⁸ A conscientious employer now pays his servant a wage in complete accord with

the teaching of the Church. But for many years he paid him a smaller wage which, however, was on a par with the "going wage" as paid by others for similar work. This man now wants to know whether he owes the servant any restitution for the years in which the smaller wage was paid. *L'Ami* answers that he does owe restitution if he paid less than the wage that was due in strict justice; and as a norm for strict justice *L'Ami* applies the words of *Rerum Novarum*: "the wage should not be less than enough to support a worker who is thrifty and upright." Does the "going wage" conform to this minimum norm? *L'Ami* admits that it does not necessarily conform, but believes that it is usually sufficient in a region where men are honest and not accustomed to take advantage of others. In the case proposed, it exempts the employer from restitution.

It is surprising that *L'Ami* cites *Rerum Novarum* for the Papal teaching on the minimum just wage. Many theologians held that the doctrine of *Rerum Novarum* on the wage due in commutative justice referred to an individual wage; but it is hardly possible to explain the teaching of *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Divini Redemp-*

⁵ E.g., Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXII (1950), 467.

⁶ *Catholic Mind*, XLVIII (1950), 700-704. See also the digest of the statement of the Netherlands hierarchy "On Social Justice," *ibid.*, XLVII (1949), 748.

⁷ *Catholic Social Principles* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950), pp. 418-21.

⁸ *L'Ami*, Sept. 28, 1950, pp. 587-89.

toris as referring to an individual wage. Leone Babbini makes much of these latter encyclicals in arguing that a family wage is due in commutative justice,⁹ and he shows little patience with Iorio's contention that even after the *Divini Redemptoris* it is not certain that strict (commutative) justice demands a family wage.

WORKING CONDITIONS

It is rather common today, I think, that union contracts include specifications concerning decent working conditions; and, of course, conditions included in a contract are due in strict justice. But, supposing there are no explicit specifications, are certain minimum conditions implicitly included in the wage contract and therefore due in commutative justice? Fr. McCarthy answers in the affirmative and suggests this general formula for such minimum conditions: "The employer is bound in strict justice to provide, as far as the nature of the work allows, such working conditions as constitute the ordinary safeguards against serious injury to the soul, mind and body of his employees."¹⁰ He admits that it is difficult to define these ordinary safeguards precisely and cites Leo XIII's sugges-

tion that in this matter the state should intervene, if necessary. He thinks, however, that such state regulations as go beyond the minimum included in his general formula would not bind in strict justice.

I should add that Fr. McCarthy by no means limits the employer's duty to providing the minimum. This is merely the norm for commutative justice, apart from explicit contract. "But . . . beyond this sphere of strict justice," he writes, "there lies the wide field in which the great virtues of social justice and charity claim and must be accorded their due."

Speaking of the system of vocational groups urged by the Popes, the Netherlands hierarchy says that "in the years to come this will be the social question *par excellence*."¹¹ Perhaps it has already become such. Certainly there is a growing interest throughout the world in this Papal program for the reorganization of economic society. Writing on this subject, William J. Smith, S.J., insists that the system of vocational groups is not merely a Papal directive but a natural necessity for the well-being of society in its present stage of development.¹² He contends also that capitalism as it now exists in

⁹ "Dal diritto al lavoro al salario familiare," *Palestra del Clero*, XXIX (1950), 817-22.

¹⁰ "The Obligation of an Employer to Provide Decent Working Conditions," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, LXXII (1949), 542-45.

¹¹ *Catholic Mind*, XLVII (1949), 749.

¹² The 'Catholic' Viewpoint on Industry Councils," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXII (1950), 107-20.

America is incompatible with this system and that it must be condemned. Fr. Cronin thinks it unwise to say that American capitalism should be condemned; he prefers to say that it needs reform.¹³ G. Gilleman, S.J., reviews an article published in *L'Osservatore Romano* and signed by the chief editor, Count della Torre, which denounces capitalism, without limits as to national boundaries, and which concludes with the interesting observation that "a marriage between the Church and capitalism . . . would be invalid according to any treatise *de matrimonio* on the grounds of *disparitas cultus*." Despite the Count's unyielding conclusion, Fr. Gilleman adds: "The Popes have never condemned capitalism in itself, but they have condemned its abuses and the pernicious theory of economic liberalism."¹⁴

One evil of capitalism as we have it is the withdrawing of personal responsibility from the private owner and handing it over to anonymous corporate groups. But, as Pius XII remarked in his address of June 3, 1950:

A similar danger is likewise present

when it is claimed that the wage-earners in a given industry have the right to economic joint-management, notably when the exercise of this right rests in reality, directly or indirectly, with organizations managed from outside the establishment.

As a matter of fact, neither the nature of the labor contract nor the nature of the business enterprise in themselves admit necessarily of a right of this sort. It is unquestionable that the wage-earner and the employer are equally the subjects, not the objects, of a nation's economy. There is no question of denying this parity. It is already an established principle of social policy; it would be asserted still more effectively were that policy to be organized on the occupational level.¹⁵

As I understand it, these remarks of the Holy Father referred to certain Catholic reformers in Europe, notably in Germany, who were claiming participation in management as a right for the worker. The address occasioned much comment, and some wondered whether Pius XII was contradicting what Pius XI had said about the partnership of management and labor. On this subject Fr. Cronin writes:

It would be a mistake to hold that this Papal address modified in any manner the basic program of structural re-

¹³ *Catholic Social Principles*, pp. 264-66. Fr. Smith, while praising the general excellence of the book, has severely criticized Fr. Cronin's position on capitalism. Personally, I like the moderate attitude that Fr. Cronin manifests here and throughout this very helpful book. See also "Pope Pius XII on Capitalism" and "Pope Pius XII Demands Economic Reforms," by Benjamin L. Masse, S.J., *America*, LXXXIV, 277-79, 378-81.

¹⁴ Fr. Gilleman's remarks are in *Clergy Monthly*, XIV (1950), 149-51. Count della Torre's editorial was in *L'Osservatore*, May 8, 1949.

¹⁵ *Catholic Mind*, LVIII (1950), 508.

form outlined by Pius XII's predecessor. On the contrary, the Holy Father noted that the reforms advocated in his address could best be worked out by a functionally organized society. On the broader level of economic life, in dealing with problems which transcend the individual company, labor and management are equals. But on the plant level such equality may not be demanded as a right.

It would be desirable, through collective bargaining and other methods, to achieve for the workingman a higher status than that of wage-earner. Such accommodations should be worked out through good will on both sides. But Catholic scholars would err in concentrating upon an alleged right, especially to the neglect of more vital problems, such as the "urgent problem . . . the imminent and permanent threat of unemployment."¹⁶

I had intended giving more space to this problem of "co-determination," but I find that the growing literature is too great for me to attempt to summarize. For instance, almost every issue of *America* from mid-July to October has something on the topic. And, as I write this, I note that the new publication, *Social Order*, promises an article entitled "Co-Determination in Germany" for its first number.¹⁷ This will already be in print when my notes are published.

Stephen P. Ryan offers a calm, enlightening survey of the hopeful and not so hopeful aspects of Southern attitudes toward the Negro.¹⁸ Among the unpleasant aspects is this picture of the laborer's plight: "In the fields of skilled and semi-skilled labor, the Negro has advanced but little. It is next to impossible for a colored man to become a painter, a plasterer, a carpenter or an electrician. The unions simply will not grant him membership."

In his survey of employer and union discrimination against racial and religious minorities, Fr. Cronin says that this practice is certainly against charity and very probably against justice. In fact, he thinks it is clearly against justice, but the kind of justice violated is obscure.¹⁹

It is unfortunate that in his further analysis of this problem Fr. Cronin uses only the example of the employer who denies a job to a properly qualified worker because of race, religion, or national origin. This is against social justice, he says, because it is against the common good. On the other hand, it does not seem to be against commutative justice because, though a man has a right to work, he has ordinarily no right to

¹⁶ *America*, LXXXIII (1950), 462.

¹⁷ *Social Order* is published by the Institute of Social Order, St. Louis, Mo. Up to the present year its circulation was limited to Jesuits, who used the magazine as a means of helping one another in the social apostolate. The limitation on circulation is now removed.

¹⁸ "Racial Attitudes in the South Today," *America*, LXXXIV (1950), 157-59.

¹⁹ *Catholic Social Principles*, pp. 318-21.

be employed by a particular person. This latter argument may have value regarding individual employers, but I suggest that it is not applicable to union discrimination. The union is not a private person. I should think

that every worker has a strict right to an equal opportunity to join a union, and that to deny him this opportunity when he has given no occasion for such denial is a violation of commutative justice.



Communists Sabotage Unions

But I think I detect two subtler wounds that Communists in the unions they have controlled have deliberately inflicted upon American labor. The point is simple. Unions have to be both good fighting organizations and good cooperating organizations. I think it is pretty plain that Communist-controlled unions have been neither good fighting organizations nor good cooperating organizations. And I think, too, the reasons are plain.

They have not fought employers enough because they want employers not to fight back for fear they would lose control of these unions. At the same time Communist-controlled unions have fought against a long-range, steady and decent policy of cooperation of business and unions in plants, companies, industry, the country, the regions of the world and the world as a whole. They have fought such cooperation because if cooperation of business and labor, and of government, and of agriculture came, their prophecy of collapse and depression, of revolution or of tricky seizures of powers over peoples would be gone with the wind and all their twisted hopes of a cruel dictatorship leading America into a Moscow-ruled world would be gone.

Communist union leaders thus sin in two ways. They are both too soft and too hard. When it is to their foreign purpose, they make contracts that are too soft. And then they bitterly oppose any long-range employer-labor cooperation which would put industry in a position to prevent a depression, get a settled, consecutive and organized way for the United States and the world, and satisfy the decent and reasonable needs of life. They want people instead to rush, in despair, into a bloody and regimented dictatorship. They are soft towards evil and hard towards good.

Their soft policy in contracts is bad enough. Their hard policy against real, honest-to-God labor-business-farmer-government cooperation is far worse. The soft policy is minor tactics to keep themselves friends of business firms. The hard policy is major strategy to undermine America and the world.—*From an address by the Rev. Raymond A. McGowan to the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers—CIO, Milwaukee, Wis., Dec. 4, 1950.*

A Call to Failure

CHARLES W. O'BRIEN

An address at the annual Senior Communion Breakfast, Boston College, Boston, Massachusetts, June 10, 1951.

I HAVE always believed that after-breakfast speaking is a peculiarly sadistic form of cruel and unusual punishment plainly falling under the condemnation of the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. More years ago than I care to remember I sat where you now sit and listened with the slightly bored, tolerant condescension characteristic of a college senior—of my generation, that is—to one who to my youthful eyes seemed—and I say it with all charity—like something dredged up out of the depths of an antediluvian society, and wondered what on earth he could tell me that I needed to know that I did not already know. The passage of time and my transmigration from *that* side of the head table to this has not materially altered my viewpoint.

In all seriousness it is not you who should look to me for counsel or guidance or advice; rather it is I who should return for renewal and fresh inspiration to this college of ours and to you who are her latest sons. It is I who have become so entangled amid the trees as to have lost sight of the forest. It is you who see life clearly and see it whole with the

true and undistorted perspective which is the end result of your four years at University Heights. With you—now—first things come first. Ends and means fall into their proper sequence. A hierarchy of values is so firmly implanted in your minds and hearts as to have become second nature in both thought and action. Religion, philosophy, the arts, the sciences have gone into your moulding. You will never again be closer to the wellsprings of clear thinking and right acting than you are today. And so it is in no sense of false humility or obsequious Uriah Heep-ism that I say that it is I who come to learn—or re-learn—from you the things that really count.

The world needs you. The world needs the things that you have acquired here, that you have come to stand for, that you are. It needs the clear, white light of your intellectual vision to penetrate the gray, amorphous confusion of muddle-headedness, illogicality, half-truths and illusion that enshrouds the minds of men and to spotlight in sharp, distinct outlines of black and white the very real boundaries of truth and error. It needs the rugged strength

of your moral code of living to shore up the decaying foundations of a society which has not only become physically and morally soft but has even begun to lose its grip on a moral sense, to despair of the distinction between right and wrong. It needs most of all the youth and vigor and vitality of your enthusiasm to energize the appalling apathy by which both straight thinking and right acting are being stifled.

Let me give you several examples. For some time now this nation has been Communist conscious, just as less than a decade ago it was Nazi conscious. Communism has been denounced as a brutal totalitarianism, a foreign ideology, a menace to freedom everywhere. It has been depicted as an insidious, worldwide conspiracy seeking by force and fraud to achieve its aim of universal conquest—an Oriental despotism moving steadily toward its goal of undermining and engulfing Western civilization—a thing totally alien in every aspect to the concepts of freedom and democracy which are the warp and woof of Christianity and its culture. Press and radio, pulpit and public platform, all the media of expression have been marshalled in an organized campaign to awaken America to the danger at its doors. And they are right—as far as they go. That is just the trouble. They do not go far enough. They have left the job half done. It is not what they say

but what they do not say that marks their signal failure to come to grips with the real problem.

MENACE OF SECULARISM

The real menace to the American way of life is not the external threat of Communism but the corrosive influence of secularism, which has already made tremendous inroads into every phase of our national existence. Business and government, labor and education, religion, the arts, the sciences, all have felt its insidious impact. None has escaped. Consciously or unconsciously it is being preached in our churches and taught in our universities, and, most terrible of all, apotheosized in the lives of our people.

Yet basically, philosophically, Communism and secularism are one. They are both predicated on the same identical premise—the materialistic concept of life. They are one in their materialism, one in their pragmatism, one in their atheism. It is long past time that the American people faced that fact and its hideous implications. If man is all animal, if there is nothing but matter, if his only motivation is economic, if there is no immortal soul, no eternal destiny, no absolute, no God, then Hitler was right, and Stalin is right, and they differ from the modern American secularists only in being more logical in following a false philosophy to its ultimate, chaotic conclusion. In short,

we are nourishing within our breast the very viper whose head we seek to crush in far corners of the globe. That is something that badly needs to be said, and it is men such as you who are alone equipped to say it.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

A few months ago a considerable stir was caused by an invitation extended to a leading member of the National Lawyers Guild—an organization which was suspected of at least having slightly leftist tendencies, if not being actually a subversive or Communist front group—to address a segment of the student body within the halls of a local university. An immediate storm of protest blew up, followed by an equally vehement defense of the university's action or inaction. The controversy was commented on editorially in the local press. All the changes were rung on the shopworn shibboleths of freedom of speech and academic freedom. Of course, freedom of speech was not at all involved. Not even the protestors questioned the gentleman's right to be heard, whatever his opinion or cast of thought. The immediate issue was whether the university should give the tacit approval of a hearing within its official precincts to the person of the speaker, the principles of the organization which he represented and the views which he proposed to expound.

In any event the permission was granted—or rather not withdrawn—and the speaker appeared as scheduled. But the significant and serious question is whether the full implications of the controversy were appreciated even by the participants. What does academic freedom mean? What is the right and responsibility of an educational institution with respect to the principles which are enunciated in its classrooms? More basically, what is the fundamental aim of education? Is it, as it has been so glibly and widely defined in the higher echelons of American learning, the pursuit of truth, something in the nature of an intellectual fox hunt in which the objective is the chase and the quarry merely incidental? Even there the simile is inexact because a fox hunt at least presupposes a fox.

What is the presupposition of American secular education? Is it not that objective truth does not exist or is unattainable? With that postulate academic freedom becomes a slogan of sound and fury signifying nothing. If truth and error are interchangeable, if the standard is what meets the needs of a particular society at a particular place and in a particular moment of history and may change with time and locality, if there are no absolutes, then our vaunted Western culture is but a windy suspiration, lip-deep and rootless. The fact is that a man is no more

free to teach error than he is free to do wrong. And that is something that badly needs to be said. And it is men such as you who are alone equipped to say it.

Although it needs you, the world will have none of you. The world will not accept you; it will reject you; it will resist you with every device that it can conjure up. It will meet you with hatred, with contempt, with scorn, with contumely, with ridicule and, most deadly of all devices, with a tremendous indifference, a cold, sodden mass of apathy which will have to be blasted into animation by the detonator of your relentless enthusiasm—which is another word for love. You have a far more authoritative assurance of that destiny than any words of mine. You have the Divine assurance: "If the world hates you, be sure that it hated Me before it learned to hate you. If you belonged to the world, the world would know you for its own and love you; it is because you do not belong to the world, because I have singled you out from the midst of the world, that the world hates you. Do not forget what I said to you. No servant can be greater than his master. They will persecute you just as they have persecuted Me; they will pay the same attention to your words as to Mine. And they will treat you thus because you bear My name."

Have no illusions about what life

holds in store for you if you truly bear the name of Christian and the standard of Christ. The world will hate you because your lives will hold the mirror up to its spiritual deficiencies, its intellectual errors and its moral decay. It will despise you because you wear the motley with which it decked Him two centuries ago. It will laugh at you as impractical visionaries and dreamers following an impossible ideal. And it will strive desperately to ignore your efforts to rekindle the fire which He came to cast upon the earth. You will win no spurious headlines hailing you as a success as the world measures success. But do not let that discourage or deter you. Never forget that the only complete success story that this world has known was written in blood by a Man on a cross.

One of the great retreat masters of this generation has struck off the true meaning of success very simply but eloquently in his concise summary of the familiar parable of Dives and Lazarus: "Dives died and went to hell; he's been there ever since; he's there today; he'll be there forever. Lazarus died and went to heaven; he's been there ever since; he's there today; he'll be there forever." What is success? You know the answer to that question because you have learned it here.

Commencement time is a season for wishing success to the graduate and unfortunately for telling him ad

infinitum and *ad nauseam* how to achieve it. I pray thee hold me excused from such a chore. I do not recommend that you carry always with you a pocket copy of "How To Win Friends and Influence People"—which, incidentally, is not a modern paraphrase of the second great commandment of love of neighbor. Rather I would urge you to eschew success, for it is the failures of history who have remade the world. Even the pagan Homer had a flash of intuitive insight in this regard, for it is Hector dragged in the dust three times about the walls of Troy behind the chariot of the victor Achilles who has come down to us as the hero of the *Iliad*.

The Christian vocation is a call to failure, to the imitation of the glorious failure and folly of Christ, whose words still ring down the corridors of time: "Have courage! I have overcome the world!" G. K. Chesterton has caught the spirit of that vocation in imperishable poetry in three stanzas of his epic masterpiece, "The Ballad of the White Horse." At one stage of the poem the fortunes of the English are at their lowest ebb in the

battle to stem the invasion of the Danish hordes and in his desperate plight King Alfred turns in prayer to Mary and asks her for a sign of ultimate victory. Mary replies:

*But you and all the kind of Christ
Are ignorant and brave,
And you have wars you hardly win
And souls you hardly save.*

*I tell you naught for your comfort,
Yea, naught for your desire,
Save that the sky grows darker yet
And the sea rises higher.*

*Night shall be thrice night over you,
And heaven and iron cope.
Do you have joy without a cause
Yea, faith without a hope?*

I have not intended to preach a sermon or to indulge in an exercise in oratory. I hope that I have done neither. I have tried to tell you plainly and matter-of-factly why you must hold fast to the ideals which you have learned under "the towers on the Heights." That message can be summed up simply, without rhetoric and very sincerely in three short sentences. There is only one call: "Come, follow Me." You are Christ's men. Walk worthy of your calling.

Love Thy Neighbor

Now America was founded on an act of faith. Without God and Christian charity this country would have been impossible. I therefore believe it will not be by materialism or by humanism that America can champion the cause of human rights, but by a genuine reaffirmation of the spiritual sources of your life. And this will really come about only when you love man because God has first loved and forgiven him.—Charles Malik in the *COMMONWEAL*, October 12, 1951.

Editorials

Representation To The Vatican

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S decision to appoint an ambassador to the Vatican is a bold and highly provocative stroke of statesmanship. He could have named a personal representative, as Franklin D. Roosevelt did. Or he could have sent a minister. But, having decided to resume relations with the Holy See, he has gone the whole hog, and nominated an ambassador, thus putting this country on a par with 19 of the 37 countries which maintain diplomatic representation at the Vatican. No move of the President's on the foreign scene is likelier to cause more controversy. The election year session of Congress beginning in January, already due to be feverishly contentious, is now assured of an issue which will stir up a mighty commotion when the appointment comes up for senatorial confirmation.

When Mr. Truman sent up his trial balloon on this momentous subject a little more than a year ago, this newspaper supported him. The President got an emotional response pro and con which was a foretaste of the debate to come. In our limited sphere

there was a like reaction—not only from our readers, but also from the religious press. We have seen no reason to change our opinion of a year ago. Since the Lateran treaty of 1929, the Vatican has been a sovereign state, and though it is territorially insignificant, its ruler commands a powerful influence in world affairs. To this newspaper, recognition, as our readers are aware, means contact, and should be established and maintained with sovereign states as long as tolerable, no matter what the coloration of their politics.

Especially is this necessary with the Vatican. The Vatican is a force along with this country in anti-aggressor policy toward Soviet Russia, and the expediency of a move which would reestablish contact with the Vatican is thus compounded of wisdom. We cannot afford to work in isolation. The United States as a great world power, committed to securing the free world against an encroachment which is mainly of the creeping variety, has everything to gain in the related parallelism with the Vatican which the President has initiated. Politically the Roman Church simply cannot be ignored. And it is far more satisfactory on all counts, as we said a year ago, to hold

our consultations directly with the Pope himself, than, as now, through the mediacy of members of the American Catholic hierarchy. — THE WASHINGTON POST, *Washington*, D. C., Oct. 22, 1591.

Too "Rich" for Public Housing

HOUSING is one area of our economic life where it is easy to see the direct bearing of moral teaching. Parents readily appreciate the difficulty of living up to the full implications of Christian family life when they are compelled to rear their children in crowded, inadequate space, where privacy is insufficient for even the minimum demands of decency. Family budgets are strained to the breaking point when the only shelter available is priced beyond the means of the wage earner.

Take the specific cases of many Detroit families who are being forced to vacate low-priced public housing projects because their incomes, lately bolstered by necessary cost-of-living increases, put them above the maximum incomes allowed to families in such quarters.

In Detroit the authorities have wisely raised the maximum incomes permissible for public housing tenants. A couple with three minor dependents can now occupy a public housing unit even though their annual income amounts to as much as

\$4,100. But even so, families are being forced to vacate who cannot find other facilities within their means. Understandably, pressure is being brought to bear in order to have this maximum raised still higher. But the position taken by the housing authorities seems equitable. They can demonstrate that there are thousands of deserving tenants, waiting applicants for such accommodations, who are in much lower income brackets. These people, whose condition approaches real impoverishment, even destitution, are naturally more deserving objects of the solicitude of public housing administrators.

But what to do about the forced-out tenants? They are for the most part average factory workers raising young families. Some of them, with commendable prudence and frugality, have managed to undertake the purchase of new private homes. But for many others, this ideal solution is beyond reach.

It appears there is a critical need for perhaps as many as 20,000 low-cost, three-bedroom units that will rent for \$40 to \$60 a month. This is the sort of housing that budget experts agree should be available to the families in question. That's figured on the time-honored principle that approximately twenty per cent of total income should be allotted for shelter, embracing rent payments and related incidentals.

Can the private housing industry

fulfill this demand? If it can, it's time to get busy. Otherwise many fine citizens will be driven by desperation to embrace the panaceas so readily and glibly offered by leftists and radicals. Far better that private enterprise should bestir itself to serve these deserving Americans, rather than devote itself to the selfish process of piling up maximum profits, while wringing its hands in futility over the advances of Marxism.

If private enterprise does not furnish the vision and social-mindedness called for by the housing crisis, then some other force will inevitably flow into the vacuum. That force will be the demand for the extension of public housing, now stigmatized by business interests as a further descent into "Socialism."

How about it, private builders? Here's your opportunity for real Americanism, for a real contribution to the common good.—THE MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, *Detroit, Mich., June 21, 1951.*

Partners in Education

THEY are partners in American education. One who speaks or writes otherwise does a disservice to education and to America. There are public schools which are tax-supported and there are other public schools, mainly religion-sponsored, which are privately financed. Both are public in the sense that they

meet the needs of the people and contribute to the commonweal. They complement each other, the one in insuring universality of educational opportunity, the other in safeguarding freedom of educational enterprise. They are questionable friends of either system who would insinuate antagonism or hostility between them.

Nor are privately-financed schools a junior partner in American education except as to numbers and resources. For two hundred years before the appearance of the tax-supported school they had pride of place on the American scene. Our venerable educational institutions owe their heroic beginnings to the resolution of pioneers steeped in the wisdom of a God-centered education. Their boast of complete education can neither be disputed nor challenged.

It is hardly more than a century ago that the tax-supported public school made its appearance as a compromise that met the practical test of a solution of regional indifference and sectarian bitterness. No one at the time thought of such schools as the ideal in education. But everything we have permitted the public tax-supported schools to do they have done, and they have accomplished all that could reasonably be expected of them.

Neither type of school resents the kind of criticism that is measured and just. The hard-working staffs are

generally alert to weaknesses and welcome suggestions well-intentioned and constructive. Their problems mount with the break-down of the home and the lessening influence of the church in the lives of the young. Not the least of the problems of tax-supported education stem from the effrontery of a noisy clique which has wormed its way into positions of eminence in the National Educational Association and would force on local School Boards, willy-nilly, their own notions of democracy, sunk in secularism, which are dangerously akin to Communist inspiration, now everywhere under watchful attack.

The fury and intensity of their secularist crusade has boomeranged on all education, but particularly on the tax-supported schools, which at the moment are subjected to the most scathing attack in history. Unscrupulous people seize the opportunity to defame and smear public education and in a calculated campaign seek to undermine confidence in the nation's schools. A vicious attempt is being made to link Catholics with this volley of vilification, which seeks not the improvement but the destruction of tax-supported schools.

We resent the imputation and re-

pudiate it with all the scorn that the efforts of those who would sow confusion merit. If Catholics have been critical of the shortcomings of these schools, shortcomings we remember that are sanctioned by law, it is a criticism that is tempered with sadness that the tax-supported schools cannot even better serve America in giving the type of education they themselves would wish to give.

Here in Los Angeles, we are indeed partners in education. Friendly relations and helpful cooperation have distinguished the spokesmen of both systems of schools. We salute the local educational authorities for their auxiliary program of moral and spiritual values and for their sincere desire to remedy an imposed deficiency by cooperating whole-heartedly with religious bodies in release-time programs. The tax-supported schools are our schools, too, and the Catholics of Los Angeles are proud of them. We will stand steadfast at their side until the fury of this outrageous attack abates. Then in new resolve we shall together pledge ourselves to safeguard for our Southland what is finest and best in education.—*THE TIDINGS, Los Angeles, Calif., Oct. 5, 1951.*

Death resembles thunder: it frightens us, but what makes it terrible is what preceded it.—*Fra Pacifico in the CHRISTIAN FAMILY, November, 1951.*

Documentation

Apostolate of the Midwife

POPE PIUS XII

*An address by His Holiness to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives,
October 29, 1951.*

THE object of your profession, beloved daughters, the secret of its greatness and beauty, lies in keeping careful watch over the humble, silent cradle where, into the germ given by the parents, God breathes an immortal soul, so that you may tend the mother and prepare for the happy birth of the child she carries within her.

If you consider the wonderful collaboration of parents, nature and God, whence there comes to light a new human being made according to the image and likeness of the Creator (Gen. I, 26-27), how can you not realize to the full the great value of the part you play in this task? "I know not how you were formed in my womb," the heroic mother of the Machabees said to her sons. "For I neither gave you breath, nor soul, nor life, neither did I frame the limbs of everyone of you. But the Creator of the world . . . formed the nativity of man" (2 Mach. 7, 22).

For this reason, those who approach the cradle wherein life is formed, assisting this activity in one way or other, must know the order that the Creator wishes to be preserved there and the laws that govern it. Hence it is not a question here of simple physical or biological laws, which agents without reason and blind forces necessarily obey, but of laws whose execution and whose effects are entrusted to the free and voluntary cooperation of man.

The order established by the Supreme Mind tends to the object willed by the Creator. It embraces man's visible activities and the invisible participation of his free will; it implies both doing and not doing when duty so dictates. Nature puts at man's disposal the whole chain of causes giving rise to a new human life: it is man who has to release the living force, nature that must develop its course and bring it to completion. Once man has performed his part and put into motion this wondrous evolution of life, his duty is to respect its progress religiously, and this is a duty that forbids his halting the work of nature or hindering its natural development.

Thus the role of nature and that of man are clearly determined. Your professional training and experience fit you to know what man and nature do no less than the laws and rules to which both are subject. Your conscience, enlightened by reason and faith under the guidance of the Authority

established by God, teaches you how far lawful action extends and where the obligation to abstain from action strictly imposes itself.

In the light of these principles We now propose to put before you some considerations on the apostolate to which your profession binds you. Every profession carried out with God's blessing brings with it a mission, the mission of putting into practice within the profession itself the teaching and intentions of the Creator and of aiding men to understand the justice and holiness of the Divine plan and the good that comes to them from this plan when carried out.

I

Carrying Out the Apostolate

Your apostolate is carried out in the first place through yourselves.

Why do people call upon your services? Because they are convinced that you know your business; because you know what the mother and child need, the dangers to which both are exposed, how these dangers can be avoided or overcome. People expect advice and help from you, not of an infallible nature, of course, but within the bounds of human knowledge and power, in keeping with the progress and present state of the theory and practice of the work in which you specialize.

If people expect all this from you, it is because they trust you, and this trust is something eminently personal. Your person must inspire it. That such trust be not deceived is not only your keen desire but also a demand of your office and profession—therefore, a duty of your conscience. For this reason, you must strive to rise to the height of your specific knowledge.

Your technical ability is also a requirement and a form of your apostolate. What credit would be given to what you say about moral and religious problems connected with your office if you were to appear deficient in your technical knowledge? On the other hand, if, by your superior technical capacity, you are able to command respect, your intervention when morals and religion are concerned will carry much more weight. To the favorable opinion won for yourselves by your proficiency, there will be added in the minds of those who call on you the well-founded conviction that Christianity as carried out faithfully by people who are convinced of its truth, far from being an obstacle to professional worth, is a stimulus for and a guaranty of it. Such people will see clearly that in the exercise of your profession you are aware of your responsibilities before God; that in your faith in God you find the strongest motive for rendering service, increasing your dedication in proportion to the need; that from a solid religious foundation, you draw strength to oppose irrational and immoral practices—whatever their source may be—with a calm, courageous and unshakeable "No."

Esteemed and appreciated as you are for your personal conduct no less than for your knowledge and experience, you will see that you are willingly entrusted with looking after the mother and the child; and, perhaps without your being aware of it, you will exercise a deep—though often silent—and most efficacious apostolate of practical Christianity. However great the moral

authority due to strictly professional qualities, man's actions for the benefit of his fellow-kind are wrought in the first place with the stamp of humanity and true Christianity.

II

Value of Human Life

The second aspect of your apostolate is zeal in upholding the value and inviolability of human life.

The present world has urgent need of being convinced by the triple testimony of mind, heart and facts. Your profession offers you the chance of giving such testimony and makes this a duty. Sometimes this testimony will express itself in a mere word spoken opportunely and with tact to the mother or father, but in the majority of cases it is your conduct and your conscientious way of going about things that have a discreet and silent influence on the parents. More than other people you are capable of understanding and appreciating what human life is in itself and what it is worth in the eyes of sane reasoning, your conscience, society, the Church and, especially, God. The Lord has created all other things on earth for man; and so far as his being and essence are concerned, man has been created for God, and for no other creature, although so far as his activity is concerned he has obligations toward the community. Now the infant is "man," even though it be not yet born, to the same degree and through the same title as the mother.

Every human being, even the infant in the maternal womb, has the right to life *immediately* from God, not from the parents or any human society authority. Therefore there is no man, no human authority, no science, no medical, eugenic, social, economic or moral "indication," which can show or give a valid juridical title for the *direct*, deliberate disposition of an innocent human being—which is to say, a disposition that aims at its destruction either as an end in itself or as the means of attaining another end that is perhaps in no way illicit in itself.

Thus, for example, to save the life of the mother is a most noble end, but the direct killing of the child as a means to this end is not licit. The direct destruction of what is called "worthless life," born or unborn, practised a few years ago on many occasions, can be justified in no way. For this reason, when this practice began, the Church formally declared that the killing, even by order of public authority, of those who although innocent are not only useless to the nation on account of physical or psychic defects but also a burden upon it, is contrary to positive natural and divine right and, therefore, illegal (Dec. Holy Office 2 Dec. 1940.—*Acta Apos. Sedis* Vol. 32, 1940, pp. 553-554). The life of an innocent person is unouchable. Any direct attempt or aggression against it is a violation of one of the basic laws without which men cannot live together in safety. There is no need for Us to go into detail regarding the significance and weight of this basic law as far as your profession is concerned. But remember that the law of God rises unshakeable above all human laws, above all "indications."

The apostolate of your profession imposes upon you the duty of making other people know the respect and esteem of human life which you nourish within you because you are convinced of the truth of Christianity. When the need arises, you must defend it boldly, and when necessary, and you are able to do so, you must protect the defenseless and still hidden life of the child, supporting your action with the force of the Divine Commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex. 20, 13). Such defensive action is sometimes most necessary and urgent, but it is not the most noble and important part of your mission, a mission which is not merely negative but eminently constructive, one which tends to promote, edify and strengthen.

CHILD A GIFT OF GOD

Instill in the mind and heart of the mother and the father esteem, desire and joy for the newborn child; make them welcome it with love from the moment of its birth. The child formed in the womb of its mother is a gift of God (Ps 126, 3), Who entrusts it to the parents. How delicately, how enchantingly, Holy Scripture describes the father sitting at table surrounded by his sons! They are the reward of the upright man, just as sterility is often the punishment of the sinner. Hear what Scripture says in the unsurpassable verses of the Psalm: "Your wife (shall be) as a fruitful vine within your house, your children as olive-shoots round about your table. Behold, thus is that man blessed who fears the Lord" (Ps 127, 3-4). But of the evil-doer it is said: "May his posterity be given over to destruction; may their name be blotted out in the next generation" (Ps 108, 13).

At the birth of the child, hasten, like the Romans of old, to place it in the arms of the father but with an immeasurably greater spirit. For the ancient Romans this meant a recognition of paternity and the authority deriving from it: but in your case, it is an act of homage to and recognition of the Creator, an invoking of the Divine blessing, the duty of carrying out the office given by God with devotion and affection. If the Lord praises and rewards the faithful servant for the fruitful use of his five talents (Math. 25, 21), what praise, what reward will He reserve for the father who has cherished and reared for Him the human life entrusted to him, a life worth more than all the gold and silver in the world!

But your apostolate is chiefly concerned with the mother. There is no doubt that the voice of nature speaks to her heart and fills it with the desire, the joy, the courage, the love and the will to look after the child. Yet, in order to overcome cowardly suggestions, whatever form they take, this voice needs to be strengthened and assume a supernatural tone, so to speak. It is you who, more by your whole manner of being and doing than by words, must help the young mother appreciate the greatness, the beauty, the nobility of that young life forming and living within her womb, born of her, carried in her arms and fed at her breast. In her heart and eyes you must see that there is a reflection of the great gift of the love of God for her and her child.

In Holy Scripture there are numerous examples echoing the prayers of supplication and the hymns of joyous thanksgiving of many a mother who,

after having implored with tears in her eyes for the grace of becoming a mother, has been finally heard. And the very labor which, after original sin, the mother must suffer to bring her child into the world is nothing but another bond drawing mother and child even closer. The more pain it cost her, the more a mother loves her child. He Who moulds the mother's heart expresses this truth with profound and moving simplicity. "A woman about to give birth has sorrow because her hour has come. But when she has brought forth the child, she no longer remembers the anguish for her joy that a man is born into the world" (John 16, 21). And through the pen of St. Paul the Apostle, the Holy Ghost again shows the greatness and joy of motherhood: God gives the child to the mother but in so doing He causes her to cooperate effectively in the unfolding of the flower whose seed He has placed within her. And this cooperation becomes a path leading to eternal salvation: "Woman will be saved by child-bearing" (1 Tim. 2, 15).

This perfect agreement between faith and reason gives you the guarantee that you are in the right and can carry out with absolute security your apostolate of esteem and love of life being born. If you succeed in carrying out this apostolate by the cradle-side where the newly born child lies whimpering for the first time, you will not find it too hard to obtain that which your conscience as midwives, in harmony with the laws of God and nature, makes you prescribe for the good of the mother and of the child.

There is no need for Us to show you experienced women the great necessity today for this apostolate of esteem and love of a life just born. Unfortunately, there are many cases where speaking, even cautiously, of children as a "blessing" is sufficient to provoke contradiction or even derision. Very often the idea and remarks about the great "burden" of children dominate. How opposed is such a frame of mind to God's language and the language of Holy Scripture and even to sound reason and the sentiment of nature. If there are conditions and circumstances where, without violating God's law, parents can avoid the "blessing" of children, nevertheless these cases of "*force majeure*" do not authorize the perverting of ideas, the disparaging of values and the despising of the mother who has the courage and the honor to bring forth new life.

SUPERNATURAL LIFE

What we have said up to now concerns the protection and care of life on the natural plane, but it is much more applicable to the supernatural life the child receives when it is baptized. Under the present economy there is no other way of giving this life to the child who is still without the use of reason. In any case, the state of grace at the moment of death is absolutely necessary for salvation; without it, no one can attain to supernatural happiness, the beatific vision of God. In the case of a grown-up person, an act of love may suffice for obtaining sanctifying grace and making up for the lack of Baptism. To the child still unborn or the child just born this path is not open. If, then, you consider that charity to one's neighbor means helping him when necessary, that this obligation is all the more serious and urgent when the good to be wrought or the evil to be avoided is greater and

when the needy person is less capable of helping and saving himself, then it is easy to understand the great importance of seeing that Baptism is given to a child deprived completely of the use of reason, in grave danger or certain of dying.

There is no doubt that this duty binds the parents in the first place but, in urgent cases when there is no time to lose and a priest cannot be called, you must perform the sublime office of giving Baptism. Do not fail, therefore, in this charitable service and in the exercise of this active apostolate of your profession. May the words of Our Lord comfort and encourage you: "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy" (Math. 5, 7). And what greater, what more beautiful act of mercy is there than that of ensuring for the soul of the child—on the threshold of a life just begun and that of approaching death—entry into the glory and happiness of eternity!

III

Function of Motherhood

A third aspect of your apostolate is that of helping the mother in carrying out the function of motherhood with readiness and generosity.

As soon as she heard the Angel's message, Our Blessed Lady replied: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Be it done to me according to Thy word" (Luke, I, 38). It was a "be it done," an ardent consent to the vocation of mother, a virginal motherhood in no way to be compared with any other. Yet it was a real motherhood in the true and proper sense of the word (Cf. Gal., IV, 4). For this reason, when reciting the "Angelus," Catholics follow the remembrance of Our Lady's acceptance with "And the Word was made Flesh" (John, I, 14).

It is one of the fundamental demands of the right moral order that sincere inner acceptance of the office and duties of motherhood correspond to the use of the conjugal rights. This is the condition on which the woman walks along the path marked out by the Creator, going toward the end He has assigned to His creature by making her, through the exercise of that function, a sharer in His goodness, His wisdom and His omnipotence, according to the message of the Angel: "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and shalt bring forth" (Luke I, 31).

If such be the biological basis of your professional work, the object of your apostolate will be to act so as to maintain, revive and stimulate the feeling and the love of the office of motherhood.

When a married couple esteem and appreciate the honor of bringing forth a new life, whose advent they await with holy impatience, your role is an easy one. All you have to do is to encourage this feeling in the couple: readiness to welcome and care for that life being born follows of itself. Unfortunately, it is not always thus. Often the child is not wanted. Worse, it is feared. Under such conditions, how can people be ready to carry out their duty? In cases like this, your apostolate must be exercised in an effective and efficacious way: negatively, in the first place, by your refusal to cooperate in anything that is immoral; then, constructively, by striving

delicately to banish prejudices, apprehension or cowardly excuses in order to remove, as far as you are able, even external obstacles that might render the acceptance of motherhood a painful thing.

If people ask your advice and help merely to ease procreation of new life, to protect it and direct it toward its full development, you can co-operate unhesitatingly. But in how many other cases do they have recourse to you for hindering procreation and conservation of this life with no regard for the commandments of the moral order? To concede such requests would be lowering your knowledge and your ability by making you accomplices in an immoral action; it would be a perversion of your apostolate. This demands a calm but categorical "No" that does not allow the laws of God and the dictates of one's conscience to be transgressed. Therefore, your profession compels you to have a clear knowledge of this Divine law so that you can make it respected without going beyond its precepts.

NATURAL AND DIVINE LAW

In his Encyclical *Casti connubii* of December 31, 1930, Our predecessor, Pius XI, of happy memory, solemnly restated the basic law of the conjugal act and conjugal relations. "Every attempt on the part of the married couple during the conjugal act, or during the development of its natural consequences, to deprive it of its inherent power and to hinder the procreation of a new life is immoral. No 'indication' or need can change an action that is intrinsically immoral into an action that is moral and lawful" (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, Vol. 22, pp. 559 seq.).

This prescription holds good today just as much as it did yesterday. It will hold tomorrow and always, for it is not a mere precept of human right but the expression of a natural and Divine law.

May Our words be a sure rule for every case in which your profession and your apostolate demand of you clarity, firmness and determination.

STERILIZATION VIOLATES MORAL LAW

It would be very much more than a mere lack of readiness in the service of life if the man's attempt affected not just a single act but the organism itself, in order to sterilize and deprive it of the faculty of procreating a new life. In this case, too, you have, in the teaching of the Church, a clear rule for your inward and outward conduct. Direct sterilization, that which aims at making procreation impossible as both means and end, is a grave violation of the moral law, and therefore illicit. Even public authority has no right to permit it under the pretext of any "indication" whatsoever, and still less to prescribe it or to have it carried out to the harm of the innocent. This principle has been already stated in the Encyclical of Pius XI which We have quoted (pp. 564, 565). Therefore, ten years ago, when sterilization came to be more widely applied, the Holy See found itself in need of stating expressly and publicly that direct sterilization, either permanent or temporary, of man or of woman, is illegal by virtue of the natural law from which, as you are aware, the Church

has no power to dispense (Dec. S. Off. Feb. 22, 1940: *Acta Ap. Sedis*, 1940 p. 73).

Use all your strength, therefore, in opposing these perverse tendencies and refuse to cooperate with them.

Then there is the serious question today as to whether and how far the obligation of ready disposition to serve motherhood can be reconciled with the ever more widely diffused recourse to the periods of natural sterility (the so-called *agenetic* periods of the woman), which seems to be a clear expression of the will contrary to that disposition.

NORMS FOR USING "RHYTHM"

It is rightly expected that you be well informed from the medical point of view about this theory and of the progress that is likely to be made in it. It is also expected that your advice and aid be not based on popular publications but founded on scientific objectivity and the authoritative judgment of specialists in medicine and biology. It is your office, not that of the priest, to instruct married people either when they come for private consultations or through serious publications on the biological and technical aspects of the theory, without, however, allowing yourselves to be let in for propaganda that is neither right nor decent. In this field, too, your apostolate demands of you as women and Christians that you know and defend the norms of morality to which the application of this theory is subordinated. Here it is the Church that is the competent judge.

There are two hypotheses to be considered. If the carrying out of this theory means nothing more than that the couple can make use of their matrimonial rights on the days of natural sterility too, there is nothing against it, for by so doing they neither hinder nor injure in any way the consummation of the natural act and its further natural consequences. It is in this respect that the application of the theory of which we have spoken differs from the abuse already mentioned, which is a perversion of the act itself. If, however, there is further question—that is, of permitting the conjugal act on those days exclusively—then the conduct of the married couple must be examined more closely.

Here two other hypotheses present themselves to us. If at the time of marriage at least one of the couple intended to restrict the marriage right, not merely its *use*, to the sterile periods, in such a way that at other times the second party would not even have the right to demand the act, this would imply an essential defect in the consent to marriage, which would carry with it invalidity of the marriage itself, because the right deriving from the contract of marriage is a permanent, uninterrupted and not intermittent right of each of the parties, one to the other.

On the other hand, if the act be limited to the sterile periods insofar as the mere use and not the right is concerned, there is no question about the validity of the marriage. Nevertheless, the moral licitness of such conduct on the part of the couple would have to be approved or denied according as to whether or not the intention of observing those periods constantly was based on sufficient and secure moral grounds. The mere

fact that the couple do not violate the nature of the act and are prepared to accept and bring up the child which, in spite of their precautions, came into the world would not be sufficient in itself to guarantee the rectitude of intention and the unobjectionable morality of the motives themselves.

The reason for this is that marriage obliges to a state of life which, while conferring certain rights, also imposes the fulfillment of a positive work in regard to the married state itself. In such a case, one can apply the general principle that a positive fulfillment may be omitted when serious reasons, independent from the good will of those obliged by it, show that this action is not opportune, or prove that a similar demand cannot reasonably be made of human nature.

A SIN AGAINST CONJUGAL LIFE

The marriage contract, which confers upon husband and wife the right to satisfy the inclinations of nature, sets them up in a certain state of life, the married state. But upon couples who perform the act peculiar to their state, nature and the Creator impose the function of helping the conservation of the human race. The characteristic activity which gives their state its value is the *bonum prolis* ("the good of the offspring"). The individual and society, the people and the state, the Church itself depend for their existence in the order established by God on fruitful marriage. Therefore, to embrace the married state, continuously to make use of the faculty proper to it and lawful in it alone, and, on the other hand, to withdraw always and deliberately with no serious reason from its primary obligation, would be a sin against the very meaning of conjugal life.

There are serious motives, such as those often mentioned in the so-called medical, eugenic, economic and social "indications," that can exempt for a long time, perhaps even for the whole duration of the marriage, from the positive and obligatory carrying out of the act. From this it follows that observing the non-fertile periods alone can be lawful only under a moral aspect. Under the conditions mentioned it really is so. But if, according to a rational and just judgment, there are no similar grave reasons of a personal nature or deriving from external circumstances, then the determination to avoid habitually the fecundity of the union, while at the same time to continue fully satisfying their sensuality, can be derived only from a false appreciation of life and from reasons having nothing to do with proper ethical laws.

RISK OF MOTHERHOOD

Now you might press this point further, observing, perhaps, that in the exercise of your profession you sometimes come across very delicate cases in which the risk of motherhood cannot be run or must be avoided completely, and in which, on the other hand, observing the sterile periods either does not give sufficient security or has to be abandoned for other reasons. And then you ask how one can still speak of an apostolate in the service of maternity.

If in your reliable and experienced judgment conditions absolutely demand a "no," (that is, that maternity must be excluded) it would be a mistake and a wrong to impose or counsel a "yes." Here we are dealing with concrete facts, with a medical not theological question, one, therefore, which you are competent to handle. But in such cases couples do not ask you for a medical answer, which is necessarily negative, but for approval of a "technique" of the conjugal act insured against the risk of motherhood. Here is another occasion on which you are called to exercise your apostolate, insofar as you do not leave any doubt that even in such extreme cases every preventive step and every direct attempt upon the life and development of the germ is in conscience prohibited and excluded, and that there is but one way open, that of complete abstinence from every complete exercise of the natural faculty. Here your apostolate obliges you to clear, sure judgment and calm firmness.

IS ABSTINENCE IMPOSSIBLE?

But it will be objected that such abstinence is impossible, that such heroism cannot be attained. Today you will hear and read this objection on all sides, even from those who, on account of their duty and ability, should be able to judge very differently. The following argument is brought forward as a proof: "No one is obliged to do the impossible and no reasonable legislator, it is assumed, wishes by his law to oblige people to do the impossible. But for married couples long-term abstinence is impossible. Therefore, they are not obliged to abstain. The Divine law cannot mean this."

Thus, from partly true premises a false conclusion is deduced. In order to convince yourself of this, invert the steps of the argument. God does not oblige people to do the impossible. But God obliges married people to abstain, if their union cannot be fulfilled according to the laws of nature. Therefore, in this case abstinence is possible. In confirmation of this argument we have the Council of Trent which, in its chapter on the observance, necessary and possible, of the commandments teaches us that, as St. Augustine said, "God does not command impossible things, but when He commands He warns us to do what can be done and to ask what cannot and gives you help so that you can" (Conc. Trid. Sess 6, Cap. II. Denzinger n. 804; S. August. "De natura et gratia," Cap. 43, n. 50, L. Migne Vol. 44, col. 271).

Therefore, do not allow yourselves to be confused in the carrying out of your profession and your apostolate by all this talk about impossibility, either as regards your own inner judgment or in what concerns your outward conduct. Never do anything contrary to the law of God and your consciences as Christians. It is wronging men and women of our times to deem them incapable of continuous heroism. Today, for many reasons—perhaps with the goad of hard necessity or even sometimes in the service of injustice—heroism is exercised to a degree and to an extent which would have been thought impossible in days gone by. Why, then, should this heroism, if the circumstances really demand it, stop at the borders estab-

lished by the passions and inclinations of nature? The answer is clear. The man who does not want to dominate himself is incapable of so doing. He who believes he can do so, counting merely on his own strength without seeking sincerely and perseveringly help from God, will remain miserably disillusioned.

Behold, then, that which concerns your apostolate in winning couples for the service of motherhood not in the sense of a blind slavery under the impulse of nature but of a use of the rights and duties of married people governed by the principles of reason and faith.

IV.

DIGNITY OF THE HUMAN PERSON

The final aspect of your apostolate concerns the defense of the right order of values and the dignity of the human person.

The "values of the human person" and the need of respecting them is a subject which has occupied writers more and more for twenty years. In many of their writings even the specifically sexual act has its place assigned to it in the service of the married couple. The proper and more profound meaning of the conjugal right must consist in this that the union of the bodies is the expression and the actuation of a personal and affectionate union.

Articles, chapters, entire books, lectures, especially on the "technique of love," are written to diffuse these ideas, to illustrate them with advice to newly-married couples as a guide to matrimony in order that through stupidity, misunderstanding, shame, or baseless scruples, they do not miss that which God Who has created the natural inclinations also offers them. If from this complete mutual gift of the couple there arises a new life, it is a result that remains outside or, at the most, on the border of the "values of the human person," a result not denied but not desired as the center of conjugal relations.

According to these theories, your self-dedication for the good of the life still hidden in the womb of the mother and its happy birth would have no more than a secondary importance.

If this relative appreciation stressed merely the value of the persons of the married couple rather than the offspring, one could, strictly speaking, let this question pass. But we are up against a serious inversion of the order of values and ends established by the Creator Himself. We are up against the propagation of a batch of ideas and affections directly opposed to the clarity, depth and seriousness of Christian teaching. Here, then, is another place where your apostolate must enter. It may happen that you are confided in by a mother and wife and questioned about the most secret desires and the intimacies of conjugal life. How can you who are aware of your mission give prevalence to the truth and right order in the appraisals and actions of couples if you yourselves do not possess an exact knowledge and are not armed with the strength of character necessary to uphold that which you know to be true and just?

The truth is that matrimony as a natural institution, by virtue of the will of the Creator, does not have as its primary, intimate end the personal improvement of the couples concerned but the procreation and the education of new life. The other ends, though also connected with nature, are not in the same rank as the first, still less are they superior to it. They are subordinated to it. This holds true for every marriage, even if it bear no fruit, just as it can be said that every eye is made for seeing although in certain abnormal cases, because of special inward and external conditions, it will never be able to see.

DECREE ON MARRIAGE

Some years ago (March 10, 1944), with the precise aim of dispersing all these uncertainties and errors that threatened to diffuse mistakes about matrimony and the mutual relation of its ends, We Ourselves made a statement on the order of these ends. We indicated what the inner structure of the natural disposition reveals, what is the heritage of Christian tradition, what the Sovereign Pontiffs have frequently taught, and what is established in proper form by the Code of Canon Law (Canon 1013, para. 1). A few years later, to correct conflicting opinions, the Holy See issued a public decree stating that the opinion of certain recent authors could not be admitted, authors who denied that the primary end of matrimony was the procreation and education of children or taught that the secondary ends of marriage are not subordinated to the primary end but of equal importance and independent of it (S.C.C. Officii April 1, 1944. *Acta Ap. Sedis* Vol. 3, 1944, p. 103).

Does this mean that We deny or diminish what there is of good and right in the personal values arising from marriage and its carrying out? Certainly not. In matrimony, for the procreation of life, the Creator has destined human beings made of flesh and blood, endowed with minds and hearts: they are called as men, not animals without reason, to be the makers of their descendants. For this end God wishes that couples be united. Holy Scripture says of God that He created man to His image and that He created the human being both male and female (Gen. I, 27), that, as we find it so often in the sacred books, "man must abandon his father and his mother and unite himself with his wife forming one flesh" (Gen. 2, 24; Math. 19, 5; Eph. 5, 31).

SERVICE TO NEW LIFE

All this, therefore, is true and so willed by God. But it must not be divorced from the primary function of marriage, which is service to new life. Not only the common work of external life but also intellectual and spiritual endowment, even the depths of spirituality in conjugal love as such, have been put by the will of nature and the Creator at the service of our descendants. By its nature, perfect married life means also the complete dedication of the parents for the benefit of their children, and in its strength and tenderness, conjugal love is itself a postulate of the most

sincere care for the offspring and the guarantee of its being carried out (St. Thomas 3 p. q. 29 a. 2 in c. Supplmt. q. 49 a. 2 ad I).

To reduce cohabitation and the conjugal act to a pure organic function for the transmission of seed would be converting the home, the sanctuary of the family, into a mere biological laboratory. In Our address of September 29, 1949, to the International Congress of Catholic Doctors, We formally excluded artificial insemination from marriage. In its natural structure, the conjugal act is a personal action, a simultaneous and immediate cooperation on the part of the husband and wife which, by the very nature of the agents and the propriety of the act, is the expression of the mutual gift which, according to Holy Scripture, brings about union "in one flesh only."

This is something much more than the union of two seeds which may be brought about even artificially, without the natural action of husband and wife. The conjugal act, ordained and willed by nature, is a personal act of cooperation, the right to which husband and wife give each other when they marry.

Therefore, when this act, in its natural form, is from the beginning permanently impossible, the object of the marriage contract is affected by something that essentially vitiates it. It is in this connection We said: "Do not forget. Solely the procreation of a new life according to the will and plan of the Creator brings with it, in a wonderful degree of perfection, the attuation of the ends intended. At the same time it is in conformity with the corporal and spiritual nature and the dignity of husband and wife, with the normal and happy development of the child" (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, Vol. 41, 1949, p. 560).

PERSONAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES

Therefore, tell the girl who is engaged or the young wife that you have come to speak to her of the values of married life, that these personal values, whether they relate to the body, the senses, or the spirit, are really genuine but that in the scale of values the Creator has put them not in the first but in the second place.

Add this, too, something which runs the risk of being forgotten. All these secondary values in the generative sphere and activity come within the scope of the specific office of husband and wife, which is to produce new life and educate it. This is a high and noble office, but it is one that does not belong to the essence of a complete human being as though in the case when the natural generative tendency is not brought into play there would be some diminution of the human person. Renunciation of this act—especially if done for the noblest of motives—is not a mutilation of personal and spiritual values. Of this renunciation for the love of the Kingdom of God Our Lord has said: "Not all can accept this teaching: but those to whom it has been given" (Math. 19, II).

To exalt, therefore, as is frequently done today, the generative function, in even its right and moral form of conjugal life, is not only an error and an aberration. Doing this brings with it also the danger of a deviation

of the mind and affections which might hinder or suffocate good and lofty sentiments, especially among young people still without experience and ignorant of the snares of life. What normal man, healthy in mind and body, would want to belong to the number of those lacking in character and mind?

In the field where you exercise it, may your profession enlighten minds and inculcate this just order of values so that men may conform their judgment and their conduct to it.

This explanation of Ours about the function of your apostolate as midwives would be incomplete were we not to add a brief word concerning the defense of human dignity in the use of the generative inclination.

The Creator, Who in His goodness and wisdom has willed to conserve and propagate the human race through the instrumentality of man and woman by uniting them in marriage, has ordained also that in performing this function husband and wife should experience pleasure and happiness both in body and soul. In seeking and enjoying this pleasure, therefore, couples do nothing wrong. They accept that which the Creator has given them.

MODERATION

Nevertheless, even here couples must know how to contain themselves within the limits of moderation. As in eating and drinking, so in the sexual act, they must not abandon themselves without restraint to the impulse of the senses. The right norm therefore is this: The use of the natural inclination to generate is lawful only in matrimony, in the service of and according to the order of the ends of marriage. From this it follows that only in marriage, and by observing this rule, the desire for and the fruit of this pleasure and satisfaction are lawful. Hence, enjoyment is subordinated to the law of action from which it derives and not the other way about, the action to the law of enjoyment. And this law, so reasonable, concerns not only the substance but also the circumstances of the act, with the result that although the substance of the act be saved, one may sin in the manner of performing it.

Transgression of this rule is as old as original sin. But in our times there is the risk of losing sight of the basic principle. At present it is the custom to maintain in word and writing (and some Catholics do it, too) the necessary autonomy, the proper end and the proper value of sexuality and its performance independently of the object of procreation. People want to reexamine and find a new rule for the order established by God. They do not want to admit any other check on the manner of satisfying instinct than observing the essence of the instinctive act. Thus for the moral obligation to dominate the passions there is substituted license to serve blindly and without restraint the caprices and impulses of nature, a line of conduct which sooner or later can but lead to the damage of man's morals, conscience and dignity.

If nature had aimed exclusively or even primarily at a mutual gift and mutual possession of couples for pleasure, if it had ordained that act solely

to make their personal experience happy in the highest degree and not to stimulate them in the service of life, then the Creator would have adopted another plan in the formation and constitution of the natural act. But this act is completely subordinated to and ordered in accordance with the sole great law of "*generatio et educatio prolis*," ("the generation and education of offspring"), the fulfilling of the primary end of matrimony as the origin and source of life.

Unfortunately, ceaseless waves of hedonism are sweeping over the world and threaten to drown all married life in the rising flood of thoughts, desires and acts, not without grave dangers and serious damage to the primary duty of man and wife.

Too often this anti-Christian hedonism does not blush to raise this theory to a doctrine by inculcating the desire to intensify continually enjoyment in the preparation and carrying out of the conjugal union, as though in matrimonial relations the whole moral law were reduced to a regular fulfilling of the act itself, and as though all the rest, however accomplished, remained justified in the pouring out of mutual affection, sanctified by the sacrament of matrimony, worthy of praise and reward where God and the conscience are concerned. Of the dignity of man and the dignity of a Christian, which restrain excess of sensuality, no notice is taken.

No! The seriousness and sanctity of the Christian moral law do not admit unbridled satisfaction of the sexual instinct tending merely to pleasure and enjoyment. The moral law does not allow man with his reason to let himself be dominated to that point, be it a question of the substance or the circumstances of the act.

HAPPINESS IN MARRIAGE

Some people are of the opinion that happiness in marriage is in direct proportion to mutual enjoyment in conjugal relations. This is not so. Happiness in marriage is in direct proportion to the respect the couple have for each other even in their intimate relations: not that they should deem immoral and refuse that which nature offers and the Creator has given, but because the respect and the mutual esteem it generates is one of the strongest elements of a pure, hence, more tender love.

In the performance of your duties, oppose, as much as you can, the impetus of this refined hedonism which is empty of all spiritual worth and unworthy of Christian couples. Show how nature has given the instinctive desire for enjoyment and approves of it in lawful wedlock but not as an end in itself; that it is something that serves life. Banish from your minds the cult of pleasure and do your best to stop the diffusion of literature that thinks it a duty to describe in full detail the intimacy of conjugal life under the pretext of instructing, directing and reassuring. To calm the timid consciences of couples, common sense, natural instinct and a brief instruction on the clear and simple maxims of Christian morality are usually sufficient. If under special circumstances a girl who is engaged or a young wife needs further explanations on some particular point, you

must instruct her with delicacy and in conformity with the natural law and the healthy conscience of a Christian.

This Our teaching has nothing to do with Manichaeism or Jansenism, as some try to make out in justification of themselves. It is simply, a defense of the honor of Christian marriage and of the personal dignity of husband and wife.

To serve for this end is, especially in our days, an urgent duty of your mission as midwives.

And this brings Us to the end of what We wanted to explain to you.

Your work opens up to you a vast field for a many-sided apostolate; an apostolate not so much of words as of deeds and guidance; an apostolate that you can usefully exercise only if you are well aware of the object of your mission and the means of carrying it out, if you are endowed with a firm and resolute will based on profound religious conviction, inspired and given its value by faith and Christian love.

Invoking upon you the powerful aid of the Divine light and Divine comfort, We wholeheartedly give you Our Apostolic Blessing as a pledge of more abundant heavenly graces.



Sharing in Creation

In fashioning materials to his uses, man is faintly imaging forth the creative activity of God; he is expressing his "likeness" to God, and to that extent is he supremely true to his nature. This fashioning, developing, refining is not confined to what we call manufacturing; it works at higher levels, as in the educating of the children by parents, moulding and forming their mind, character, habits, and we see this wonderful power at its most sublime in the activity whereby human beings produce (we say "procreate" and the word itself is significant) other human beings.—C. Pridgeon, S.J., in *CHRISTUS REX*, July, 1951



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.